

1970

An Experimental Study of the Question Period as a Determinant of Source Credibility and Audience Attitude Toward the Speech.

Alan Lewis Mikels

Louisiana State University and Agricultural & Mechanical College

Follow this and additional works at: https://digitalcommons.lsu.edu/gradschool_disstheses

Recommended Citation

Mikels, Alan Lewis, "An Experimental Study of the Question Period as a Determinant of Source Credibility and Audience Attitude Toward the Speech." (1970). *LSU Historical Dissertations and Theses*. 1793.
https://digitalcommons.lsu.edu/gradschool_disstheses/1793

This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by the Graduate School at LSU Digital Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in LSU Historical Dissertations and Theses by an authorized administrator of LSU Digital Commons. For more information, please contact gradetd@lsu.edu.

71-3425

MIKELS, Alan Lewis, 1943-
AN EXPERIMENTAL STUDY OF THE QUESTION
PERIOD AS A DETERMINANT OF SOURCE
CREDIBILITY AND AUDIENCE ATTITUDE TOWARD
THE SPEECH.

The Louisiana State University and Agricultural
and Mechanical College, Ph.D., 1970
Speech

University Microfilms, Inc., Ann Arbor, Michigan

AN EXPERIMENTAL STUDY OF THE QUESTION PERIOD
AS A DETERMINANT OF SOURCE CREDIBILITY
AND AUDIENCE ATTITUDE TOWARD
THE SPEECH

A Dissertation

Submitted to the Graduate Faculty of the
Louisiana State University and
Agricultural and Mechanical College
in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy

in

The Department of Speech

by
Alan L. Mikel
B.A., Southern Illinois University, 1966
M.A., State University of New York at Albany, 1967
May, 1970

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The writer wishes to express his sincere appreciation to Dr. J. Donald Ragsdale for his valuable assistance and encouragement throughout this study. He is also indebted to the members of his committee: Dr. Waldo W. Braden, Dr. Owen M. Peterson, Dr. John H. Pennybacker, and Dr. Alvin L. Bertrand. In addition, he wishes to thank Dr. Kenneth L. Koonce for his assistance in setting up the study for computer analysis.

To Dr. Clinton W. Bradford and to Speech 6 instructors Laura Lemoine, Betty Lou Walters, Carol Pratt, David Ritchey, Richard Soddors, Pamela Jackson, Carroll Hickey, Margaret Jansing, and Dencil Taylor go thanks for providing their classes and their time for this project. Further acknowledgment is due to Howard Dorgan whose help in this project was invaluable. Also, the writer wishes to thank the Closed Circuit staff for their co-operation in video-taping the treatments.

Finally, a very special thanks goes to Karen, the writer's wife, without whose understanding and encouragement this study would not have been possible.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	ii
LIST OF TABLES	iv
LIST OF FIGURES	v
ABSTRACT	vi
Chapter	
I. INTRODUCTION	1
Importance of the Study	
Statement of the Problem	
Definition of Terms	
Chapter Outline of Dissertation	
II. SUMMARY OF PREVIOUS RESEARCH	9
III. THE METHOD	21
Design of the Experiment	
Development of Independent Variables	
Construction of Introductions	
Construction of Speech	
Construction of Question Periods	
The Main Experiment	
Procedure	
The Results	
Discussion	
BIBLIOGRAPHY	78
APPENDIX A	82
APPENDIX B	94
VITA	109

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
I. Group Means, Ranges, and Within Group Variances of the Ten Original Groups	27
II. Group Means, Ranges, and Within Group Variances with the New Tenth Group	30
III. Analysis of Homogeneity of Variance on the χ^2	31
IV. Raw Scores of Ego Involvement	36
V. Least Squares Analysis of Variance on the Authoritativeness Factor of Credibility	59
VI. Least Squares Analysis of Variance on the Character Factor of Credibility	60
VII. Comparisons of Group Mean Scores of the Introduction on the Authoritativeness Factor of Credibility	61
VIII. Comparisons of Group Mean Scores of the Introduction on the Character Factor of Credibility	62
IX. Comparisons of Group Mean Scores of the Question Period on the Authoritativeness Factor of Credibility	63
X. Comparisons of Group Mean Scores of the Question Period on the Character Factor of Credibility	64
XI. Comparisons of Three Levels of Introduction with Three Levels of Question Period on the Authoritativeness Factor of Credibility	65
XII. Comparisons of Three Levels of Introduction with Three Levels of Question Period on the Character Factor of Credibility	66
XIII. Least Squares Analysis of Variance for Attitude Toward Topic	67
XIV. Comparisons of Selected Group Means on the Attitude Measure Toward the Topic	68

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure	Page
1. 3 X 3 Analysis of Variance Design for Measurement of Ethos	22
2. Combinations of Treatments of Independent Variables. . .	24

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to test the question period as a determinant of audience attitude toward the source and the topic of a persuasive speech. There were three null hypotheses:

- (1) The introduction which may precede a speech has no effect on audience attitude toward the source.
- (2) The question period which may follow a speech has no effect on audience attitude toward the source.
- (3) There are no significant effects on audience attitude toward the source attributable to an interaction between the introduction to a speech and the question period.

The experiment followed a 3 X 3 factorial analysis of variance design for the measurement of source credibility or ethos. The independent variables were three levels of introduction of the speaker: high ethos introduction, low ethos introduction, and no introduction, and three levels of question period, good, bad, and no question period. Both the questions and the answers were rehearsed, as well as the speech itself. For use in this study, the entire speaking situation was video taped on two Ampex VR-660B video tape recorders and replayed to treatment groups on closed circuit television.

Subjects were students from the Speech for Business and Professional People speech course, during the Spring semester, 1970. Three weeks before the main part of the experiment, subjects were tested for credibility proneness on an Assumed Similarity between Opposites measure.

This test was used as a screening device to insure homogeneity of communicator credibility perception among treatment groups. At the same time, subjects were tested for ego-involvement on three possible topics for use in the experiment. The topic with the least amount of ego-involvement was used. Treatment groups for the main experiment allowed for all possible combinations of the independent variables. A control group for measuring initial sample attitude toward the topic was also available. After each treatment, subjects were asked to complete an ethos semantic differential which assessed speaker ethos on two factors, character and authoritativeness. Subjects were also asked to complete a semantic differential type attitude measure on the topic.

Within the limitations of this study and the method used, the following major conclusions seem justified. (1) The introduction which precedes a speech significantly affects audience attitude toward the speaker. The inclusion of three levels of introduction in this study produced significant differences. Further, the high ethos introduction produced a highly significant difference from the low ethos introduction. (2) The introduction which precedes a speech does not significantly affect audience attitude toward the topic. (3) The question period which follows a speech significantly affects audience attitude toward the speaker. When either the good or bad question period was used, there was a significant difference from instances where no question period was used. Further, the good question period produced a highly significant positive difference as compared to the bad question period. (4) The question period which follows a speech does not significantly affect audience attitude toward the topic. (5) There are significant affects on audience attitude toward the speaker attributable to an interaction

between the introduction to a speech and the question period. When paired with the good question period, the difference produced by a comparison of the high ethos introduction to the low ethos introduction was significant favoring high ethos, but on the authoritativeness factor of credibility only. When paired with the bad question period, a significant negative difference on both factors of credibility was produced.

(6) There were no significant effects on audience attitude toward the topic attributable to an interaction between the introduction to a speech and the question period.

I. INTRODUCTION

Importance of the Study

One has only to begin the text of the Rhetoric to discover that Aristotle lost no time in getting to a discussion of speaker character; "It is not true, as some writers on the art maintain, that the probity of the speaker contributes nothing to his persuasiveness; on the contrary we might almost affirm that his character [ethos] is the most potent of all the means to persuasion."¹ He explained:

The character [ethos] of the speaker is a cause of persuasion when the speech is so uttered as to make him worthy of belief; for as a rule we trust men of probity more, and more quickly, about things in general, while on points outside the realm of exact knowledge, where opinion is divided, we trust them absolutely.

Aristotle discussed three means of persuasion supplied by the speech itself: ethos, or appeals related to the character of the speaker; pathos, or appeals related to the emotions of the audience; and logos, or appeals through evidence and reason. While he devoted less time to the concept of ethical proof than he did to other types, it is nevertheless plain that Aristotle considered the personal character of speakers to be very important. He condemned his predecessors for maintaining that "the probity of the speaker contributes nothing to his persuasiveness," and went on to discuss ethos in terms of "three things, apart from demonstrative proofs, which inspire belief, viz. sagacity, high

¹Aristotle, The Rhetoric of Aristotle, trans. Lane Cooper (New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, Inc., 1932), p. 8.

character, and good will."²

It has become even more evident since the time of Aristotle that the concept of speaker or source credibility is important. It follows that a knowledge of variables which might affect source credibility is also important. A vast number of public speaking situations include a question period which follows the speech itself. It is rare that, given the chance, an entire audience will pass up an opportunity to ask questions of the speaker. It is more frequent that a question period has to be curtailed due to a lack of time for all of the questions to be heard.

It is curious that such an institution as the question period has received little or no attention from either text book writers or researchers. Speakers are very much aware of the prospects of the question period, some using this time further to drive home their points and establish themselves more favorably with their audiences and some hoping that there will be no time for questions for fear of possible embarrassment. The present study investigated the effects of the question period on the credibility of the speaker for the purpose of drawing conclusions indicating whether or not the question period makes a difference in the way the audience accepts the speaker. This study is the first investigation which involved the question period in any manner whatsoever. If ethos is enhanced or detracted from by virtue of the question period, many implications pertinent to speaker success come to light.

²Lester Thonssen and A. Craig Baird, Speech Criticism (New York: The Ronald Press Company, 1948), p. 384.

Statement of the Problem

The main purpose of this study is to investigate the effects of the question period on source credibility. Many questions become obvious at the outset of such an undertaking:

1. Does the question period which follows the speech affect the ethos of the speaker?
2. Does the speaker's performance during the question period produce an attitude change toward the topic on the part of the hearers?
3. Will a speaker with high credibility be perceived as having done well in the question period, other things being equal?
4. Will a speaker with low credibility be perceived as having done poorly in the question period, other things being equal?

In addition, the following secondary questions arise:

1. Is credibility proneness of significance in studies dealing with credibility?
2. Can hearers discern differences between good and bad question periods as functions of the speaker?

Definition of Terms

In the present study, ethos is the audience's conception of the speaker's character as it is evidenced in the speaking situation. While antecedent conceptions of a speaker's character have some influence on credibility, they are unimportant in this specific experimental situation. For measurement purposes, ethos in this study is defined as the characteristics of the speaker measured by an ethos semantic differential

employing scales which represent an authoritativeness and a character factor.³

Although the question period has not been treated significantly as a performance factor, the concept itself, as a tool of rhetorical discourse, is not new. As early as circa 2160 B.C., Ptah-Hotep, a vizier who received the king's permission to instruct his son, was concerned with replies to questions as techniques for persuasion. In these oldest manuscripts known to man, Ptah-Hotep instructed Kagemni:

If you meet a debater more capable than yourself, silence will be your best defense. If he addresses thee as one ignorant of the matter, thine humbleness shall bear away his contentions.

If your oponent is weaker than you, do not scorn him; Let him alone; then shall he confound himself . . . If you are tempted to ridicule, overcome it as a thing rejected of princes.

If you are the guest of a superior, speak only when he addresses you, for you do not know what will offend him. Speak when he questioneth thee; so shall thy speech be good in his opinion.

If you know what you are talking about, speak with authority, and avoid false modesty. Make thyself to be honoured for knowledge and gentleness. Do not be silent; but do not be irritated by interruptions, nor reply heatedly.⁴

In the classical period, the question and answer form was common. However, it was usually a means of argumentation. Dialectic, defined by Aristotle as a means for providing arguments, closely approximated the question-answer form.⁵ The familiar form of the dialogue which was used in the classical period, mainly by philosophers as an instructive device,

³James C. McCroskey, "Scales for the Measurement of Ethos," Speech Monographs, XXXIII (March, 1966), 65.

⁴Giles W. Gray, "The Precepts of Kagemni and Ptah-Hotep'," Quarterly Journal of Speech, XXXI (Dec., 1946), 446.

⁵Aristotle, op. cit., pp. 8-9.

also approximated the question-answer form.

The Sophists were interested in two forms of speech - eristic and rhetoric. Eristic is described by the historians Croiset as "the art of subtle discussion between professional debaters."⁶ This form of speaking probably started by Zenon of Elea, was, it is thought, the first systematized use of the question and answer method. Aristotle's writings on the art of dialectic were the result of an evolutionary process, so to speak. Socrates began his career in the school of Zenon of Elea, Plato drew material for his dialogues from Socrates, and Aristotle was a student of Plato. It is interesting that Plato wrote nothing on the nature of dialectic, nor how it should be conducted, yet he selected the dialogue form as an instructive device. This was probably due to Plato's strong desire to be considered a philosopher, as the dialogue form was commonly used by philosophers in Plato's time.

Aristotle spends a great deal of time in several works discussing how to ask questions, but again the end is persuasion through argumentation. In each of these discussions, he includes comment on the answering of questions, dealing mostly with matter rather than manner. In Topics, which is a text which "proposes to find a line of inquiry whereby we shall be able to reason from opinions that are generally accepted about every problem propounded to us," and which has as its purpose to "say what reasoning is, and what its varieties are, in order to grasp dialectical reasoning," Aristotle discusses the aims of the answer not only in argumentative situations but in information-seeking situations as well:

⁶ Alfred Croiset and Maurice Croiset, An Abridged History of Greek Literature, translated G.F. Hefferbower, (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1904), p. 282.

In a competition the business of the questioner is to appear by all means to produce an effect upon the other, while that of the answerer is to appear unaffected by him; on the other hand, in an assembly of disputants discussing in the spirit not of a competition but of an examination and inquiry, there are as yet no articulate rules about what the answerer should aim at, and what kind of things he should and should not grant for the correct and incorrect defence of his position; - inasmuch, then, as we have no tradition bequeathed to us by others, let us try to say something upon the matter for ourselves.⁷

Aristotle also discusses the outcome of situations where the statement from the questioner is either generally accepted or generally rejected. He says that the answerer should "admit all views that are generally accepted and, of those that are not generally accepted, all that are less generally rejected than the conclusion sought by the questioner."⁸ Concerning manner of answer, Aristotle says:

If it [the question] be a view generally accepted and irrelevant, the answerer should grant it and remark that it is the accepted view: if it be a view that is not generally accepted and irrelevant, he should grant it, but add a comment that it is not generally accepted, in order to avoid the appearance of being a simpleton.

The questioner should be met in a like manner also in the case of terms used obscurely, i.e. in several cases. For the answerer, if he does not understand, is always permitted to say 'I do not understand': he is not compelled to reply 'Yes' or 'No' to a question which may mean different things. Clearly, then, in the first place, if what is said be not clear, he ought not to hesitate to say that he does not understand it; for often people encounter some difficulty from assenting to questions that are not clearly put.⁹

In his De Sophisticis Elenchis, Aristotle classifies dialogue arguments into four parts: didactic arguments, dialectical arguments, examination arguments, and contentious arguments. Regarding contentious

⁷Aristotle, "Topics," in Great Books of the Western World, (Chicago: Encyclopaedia Britannica, 1965), 246.

⁸Ibid.

⁹Ibid., p. 219.

arguments, which are those that reason or appear to reason to a conclusion from premises that appear to be generally accepted but are not so, Aristotle includes a brief discussion on the answering of questions:

What is incidentally the object of contentious arguers, though less so nowadays than formerly, would have been fulfilled, namely that the person questioned should answer either 'Yes' or 'No': whereas nowadays the improper forms in which questioners put their questions compel the party questioned to add something to his answer in correction of the faultiness of the proposition as put: for certainly, if the questioner distinguishes his meaning adequately, the answerer is bound to reply either 'Yes' or 'No'.¹⁰

In the Rhetoric, Aristotle concentrates mostly on matter when he discusses replies to interrogations. He makes one statement on manner when he says: "In replying, you should meet ambiguous questions by a reasonable definition of terms, and not answer curtly. In meeting questions that involve you in a seeming contradiction, you must explain the difficulty at the outset of your reply, before your opponent has put the next question or drawn his conclusion."¹¹ It is clear that Aristotle was offering suggestions for success in argumentation when he wrote much of his comment on questions and answers. The concept is the same, however, and his writings in this area are applicable to the present study. Operationally, the question period is defined in the present study as dialogue between the speaker and his audience in which the speaker is asked by members of the audience to respond to questions related to his subject after he has delivered his speech. There were two types of question period which were video taped for use in the present study.

¹⁰ Ibid., p. 241.

¹¹ Rhetoric 239.

Chapter Outline of Dissertation

Chapter Two presents a summary of some of the more significant literature related to the present study. Experimental studies involving credibility as an independent variable are discussed; studies dealing with congruity theory are cited; primacy-recency studies are reviewed; some studies dealing with the effects of teaching with television are discussed; and, a single study regarding assumed similarity between opposites is included.

Chapter Three deals with the design of the experiment. The hypotheses are stated at the beginning of the chapter. This is followed by a discussion of the methodology and procedure for testing for credibility proneness. In this discussion is included an explanation of the measuring device for determining credibility proneness as well as an explanation of other tests used to apply credibility proneness to the present study. Chapter Three includes a description of the development of the independent variables. Discussed first are two speeches of introduction, one constructed to produce high credibility for the source and the other constructed to produce low credibility for the source. This section is followed by a discussion of the construction of the speech used in the experiment. The last independent variable discussed is the question period which has two versions, a good version and a poor version. Both the introduction and the conclusion have a third level, that of absence of either form. Finally, Chapter Three discusses the experiment itself by describing the subjects, the methodology, and the results with a discussion. In addition, implications and suggestions for further research are brought out.

II. SUMMARY OF PREVIOUS RESEARCH

As Andersen and Clevenger have pointed out in their article on experimental research on ethos, the directions taken in this regard have been many.¹ Researchers have been trying to pin down the nature and implications of ethos by isolating a variety of variables, and they have come up with a variety of conclusions. The importance of this task was perhaps indicated by Aristotle when he asserted: ". . . we might almost affirm that his [the speaker's] character [ethos] is the most potent of all the means to persuasion."² One of the earliest experimental studies was done by Kulp in 1934 and dealt with prestige as a factor of persuasiveness.³ He used graduate students in a college of education to see whether a credible source had more influence on them than the opinions of ordinary citizens. He found that a credible source is more influential, thus supporting the theory that communicator credibility does significantly influence subsequent communication. Ewing⁴ elaborated on these findings in 1942 by using unknown or ambiguous

¹ Kenneth E. Andersen and Theodore Clevenger, Jr., "A Summary of the Experimental Research in Ethos," Speech Monographs, XXX (1963), 77.

² Aristotle, The Rhetoric of Aristotle, trans. Lane Cooper. (New York: Appleton-Century-Croft, Inc., 1932), 9.

³ D. H. Kulp, "Prestige, As Measured By Single Experience Changes and Their Permanency," Journal of Educational Research, XXVII (1934), , 663-672.

⁴ T. N. Ewing, "A Study of Certain Factors Involved in Changes of Opinion," Journal of Social Psychology, XVI (1942), 63-88,

sources but having the source state at the beginning that his position was the same as that of the audience. He found that acceptance was increased by making agreement apparent to the audience. Haiman⁵ in a 1949 study was again interested in the credibility of speakers when he experimented with the introduction as a means of establishing ethos before the speech. He used unknown speakers and identified them in terms of year in school. He used graduate students and undergraduates, both male and female. He found that by identifying the speakers in the introductions, the acceptance was significantly influenced. The graduate students were more acceptable than the undergraduates. He also found that graduate males were more acceptable than undergraduate females.

Hovland and Weiss⁶ were interested in the effects of communications from low and high credibility sources. Five days before speeches were given, subjects were asked to rate a number of possible sources on a credibility scale. Articles which were pro or con on four topics were given to both high and low credibility speakers to be delivered as speeches. Hovland and Weiss found that the subjects' attitudes toward the speakers before the speeches were presented significantly affected their evaluations of the presentations. Still concerned with source credibility, Hovland and Kelman⁷ again used the introduction as a means

⁵Franklyn Haiman, "An Experimental Study of the Effects of Ethos in Public Speaking," Speech Monographs, XVI (Sept. 1949), 190-202.

⁶Carl I. Hovland and Walter Weiss, "The Influence of Source Credibility on Communication Effectiveness," Public Opinion Quarterly, XV (1951), 635-650.

⁷H. C. Kelman and Carl I. Hovland, "Reinstatement of the Communicator in Delayed Measurement of Opinion Change," The Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, XLVIII (1953), 327-335.

of revealing personal qualities. Using the medium of radio, a speaker was introduced who spoke in favor of extreme leniency in the treatment of juvenile delinquents. Three different introductions were used, a positive version, a neutral version, and a negative version. Using the Wang-Thurstone scale of attitudes, it was found that the audience reacted more favorably toward the speaker who was introduced by way of the positive version. The neutral version ranked second, leaning toward positive evaluation.

Tompkins and Samovar⁸ were interested in the effects of credibility on the comprehension of content. They sought to determine whether the amount of information which listeners retain from an expository speech is significantly related to the degree of credibility which they assign to a source. They used four groups of beginning speech students having one control group and three experimental groups. Introductions of the speaker were varied, some being low credible introductions and others being high credible introductions. The speech remained constant. Tompkins and Samovar found that the credibility assigned to the source did not significantly affect the amount which the groups learned. Using the Cochran and Cox test, they found no significant differences between the high credibility value of 7.61, the low credibility value of 7.21, and the no introduction value of 7.62.

Greenberg and Miller⁹ investigated the effects of low credibility sources on message acceptance. Based on work of Lumsdaine and Janis,

⁸Phillip K. Tompkins and Larry A. Samovar, "An Experimental Study of the Effects of Credibility on the Comprehension of Content," Speech Monographs, XXXI (June, 1964), 120-123.

⁹Bradley S. Greenberg and Gerald R. Miller, "The Effects of Low Credible Sources on Message Acceptance," Speech Monographs, XXXIII (June, 1966), 127-136.

the experimenters made the following assumption: "A message attributed to a low-credible source immediately before its presentation generates maximum resistance to the message; hence, favorable attitude change among audience members exposed to the message will be minimal."¹⁰ Greenberg and Miller were interested in seeing whether a time span between establishment of credibility and the message would reduce the effects of low credibility. Using forty-five members of an adult P.T.A. group, they set up low credible messages and asked for evaluations from their subjects. They found that a time span did reduce the effects of low credibility.

Hovland, this time with Mandell,¹¹ was concerned with trustworthiness as a factor influencing communication. Introductions of speakers were used, and the elements of suspicion of motives, or belief in impartiality were incorporated within. Suspicion was created by using the topic "devaluation of currency," and by introducing the speaker as head of a large importing firm. The speech itself contained a statement that importers would profit from devaluation. Belief in impartiality was created by introducing a second speaker as a leading American economist. The results showed that speakers with high credibility, with regard to the communicator's intentions, elicited the more favorable responses.

The studies cited above have been included to point out that

¹⁰A. A. Lumsdaine and I. L. Janis, "Resistance to 'Counterpropaganda' Produced by One-Sided and Two-Sided 'Propaganda' Presentations," Public Opinion Quarterly, XVII (Fall 1953), 311-318.

¹¹Carl I. Hovland and Wallace Mandell, "An Experimental Comparison of Conclusion-Drawing by the Communicator and by the Audience," The Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, XLVII (1952), 581.

ethos is an influential factor in a communication situation. They are a representation of the more significant studies done in this area and are by no means all of the studies involving speaker credibility. Haiman, in his dissertation of 1948,¹² concluded that variations in the prestige of a speaker produced by varying the chairman's introductory identification were found to influence significantly the effects of a persuasive speech. Further, Haiman discovered that variations in the overall ethical appeal of speakers, produced by having persons of different ethical appeal deliver the same speech, were found to influence, in one way or another, the persuasive effect of the speech. Also, it was found that the persuasive success of several nationally known figures was positively correlated to several factors of ethos. Subsequent studies cited here have upheld Haiman's pioneer work. There is still, however, much to be done.

A very recent study in the area of speaker credibility has opened new channels of thought and has made some of the prior work somewhat questionable. Seigel, Miller and Wotring¹³ are highly critical of studies treating credibility as being dependent upon objective attributes of the source. Their work involved a determination of an individual's ability to perceive differences in the credibility of sources. They hypothesized that credibility is in the "eye of the beholder;" that is, individuals vary as to how well they are able to perceive differences in source credibility. Using a scale called Assumed Similarity between

¹²Franklyn Haiman, "An Experimental Study of the Effects of Ethos on Public Speaking," (Northwestern University, 1948), unpubl. diss.

¹³Elliot Seigel, Gerald Miller and Edward C. Wotring, "Source Credibility and Credibility Proneness; A New Relationship," Speech Monographs, XXXVI (June, 1969), 118.

Opposites (ASO), Seigel, Miller and Wotring were able to measure this perceptual ability. They found that individuals do vary in their ability to perceive differences in source credibility. This difference is referred to by the authors as credibility proneness. The significance of this study to the present one is that if credibility proneness is an important factor in credibility studies and must be accounted for it has been taken into consideration in the present methodology.

As pointed out by Andersen and Clevenger, factors already shown to affect ethos are the introduction to the speaker,¹⁴ the speech itself,¹⁵ the status of the speaker,¹⁶ the speaker's dress, the speaker's voice,¹⁷ the speaker's manner and his perceived sincerity.¹⁸ It is the contention of the writer that the question period following the speech is as much a part of the communication situation as the introduction of the speaker and the speech itself. Further, it is felt that the question period has potential to affect the ethos of the speaker and therefore the acceptance of the speech. Since this study is concerned with attitude change toward the speaker and the subject, studies dealing with congruity theory are relevant. The congruity principle may be generally stated as "changes in attitude always moving in the direction of

¹⁴Haiman, op. cit.

¹⁵Hovland and Weiss, op. cit.

¹⁶Leroy Stanley Harms, "Abstract of 'Social Judgments of Status Cues in Language,'" (Ohio State, 1959), unpubl. diss., Speech Monographs, XXVIII (August 1960), 87.

¹⁷Gordon Allport and Hadley Cantril, "Judging Personality From Voice," Journal of Social Psychology, V (1934), 37-55.

¹⁸Richard Hildreth, "An Experimental Study of Audiences' Ability to Distinguish Between Sincere and Insincere Speakers," (unpubl. diss., So. Cal., 1953).

increased congruity with the existing frame of reference." Osgood and Tannenbaum first reported on this theory in 1955; however, Berlo and Gulley have presented the principle more directly.¹⁹ With regard to the present study, the congruity principle postulates that hearers will experience internal pressure to consider the speaker's performance during the question period as positive support for their established attitudes toward the speaker by virtue of the speech and initial credibility. Berlo and Gulley found that the congruity hypothesis was successful in being able to predict the direction of the attitudinal effect. They showed that the audience's prior attitudes toward the speaker and the topic largely determined the speaker's success in motivating new attitude. Bettinghaus' study on the congruity principle²⁰ further showed that shifts in attitude toward the speaker and the topic were congruous to existing attitudes and that attitude toward the speaker seemed to be a more influential factor than attitude toward the topic with regard to the congruity hypothesis. It should follow from the congruity theory that a shift in attitude after the question period will be congruous to an individual's existing attitude toward the speaker and, most probably, the topic as well. It is felt, however, that the question period may have the capability of motivating an attitude change toward the speaker; attitude toward the topic may also change.

Experimental work in the area of primacy and recency has some implications for the present study. The first person to conduct research

¹⁹David K. Berlo and Halbert E. Gulley, "Some Determinants of the Effect of Oral Communication in Producing Attitude Change and Learning," Speech Monographs, XXIV (March, 1957), 10-12.

²⁰Erwin P. Bettinghaus, "The Operation of Congruity in an Oral Communication Situation," Speech Monographs, XXVIII, (Aug., 1961), 131-142.

isolating these variables was Lund²¹ who stated the "Law of Primacy" as: "whichever side of an issue is presented first will have greater influence on belief than the side presented second." This law is applied directly to persuasion. If it is applied to the credibility factor in the present study, the implications are that a speaker's introduction, since it is presented first, will have the greatest influence on his ethos. In this regard, the theory resembles congruity theory which was discussed previously.

Lund divided his subjects into three groups, each group consisting of approximately forty subjects. He selected his issues and prepared affirmative and negative speeches for each. The three groups of subjects were tested for attitude on the topic two days before the main part of the experiment. Then they were presented with speeches supporting each side of the issue. A primacy effect was found to exist. Knower²² conducted a similar study dealing with primacy. The major difference was that the subjects were given speeches to read instead of acting as an audience. He concluded that when speeches on opposite sides of a question were read, a primacy effect influences the amount and direction of attitude change. Knower's conclusions have been questioned, however, as only one of his four groups showed a significant effect from primacy.

Views on the effects of primacy have not gone unchallenged by researchers. Many studies have been concerned with the "law of recency"

²¹F. H. Lund, "The Psychology of Belief: IV. The Law of Primacy in Persuasion." Journal of Abnormal Psychology, XX (1925), 183-191.

²²Franklyn H. Knower, "Experimental Studies of Changes in Attitude. II. A Study of the Effect of Printed Argument on Changes in Attitude," Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, XXX (1936), 522-532.

which states that the side presented last will have a greater influence on belief than the side presented first. Cromwell²³ presented both sides of an issue to his subjects but differed from other studies in that he varied the strength of the support. His four treatment groups were given: (1) the weak affirmative and the weak negative; (2) the weak negative and the weak affirmative; (3) the strong affirmative and the strong negative; (4) the strong negative and the strong affirmative. Attitude measures were taken before and after the speeches. Cromwell found no differences with the weak speeches; however, all results regarding the strong speeches pointed to recency effects significant beyond the .01 level. These findings were in direct contradiction to those of Lund and Knower.

Hovland and Mandell, in a study previously cited, repeated a part of Lund's experiment using questionnaires to assess opinion. Three hundred and thirty-one college students were given opinion questionnaires before and after each communication. This time no significant primacy effects were obtained. Interestingly, recency was slightly favored over primacy. The experiment was again repeated by Hovland and Mandell, this time using new topics and a different group of one hundred and ninety-one students. Again the results failed to confirm Lund's initial findings. A possible explanation for the discrepancies could be that the attitude of the subjects toward the communicator in Lund's experiment significantly influenced the findings. When the same person presents both sides of an issue, he might cause some carry-over effects during the second speech.

²³Harvey Cromwell, "The Relative Effect on Audience Attitude of the First versus the Second Argumentative Speech of a Series," Speech Monographs, XVII (June, 1950), 105-122.

Perhaps the area of primacy-recency needs as much work as any of the unsettled areas. Most of the findings are inconclusive in light of subsequent research. As was pointed out, not only do the various findings disagree as to the effects of primacy and recency, but when some studies are repeated, the original findings can not be varified. Ralph L. Rosnow, who surveyed seventy-one references on recency-primacy,²⁴ pointed out that there is not sufficient evidence to support firm conclusions. He concluded that other variables have confused the findings. Rosnow found that when the topic was controversial, the subject matter interesting, the topic familiar, primacy was most influential; when the time interval between communications is increased, the more recent presentation has the most influence. It is evident that more research needs to be done. If the Law of Primacy holds, it might follow that initial credibility will be predominant over the credibility established by the question period. If recency is most influential, the question period will be predominant.

The use of the medium of closed circuit television and video tape in this study poses no problem in itself. A few of the studies which employed closed circuit television as an independent variable are reviewed here to substantiate the experimenter's belief that the medium itself has no bearing on the findings of the present study.

Most of the studies done with television as an independent variable were for purposes of determining subjects' attitudes toward the medium itself. These studies, for the most part, tested student attitude

²⁴Ralph L. Rosnow, "Whatever Happened to the 'Law of Primacy'?" Journal of Communication, XVI, (March, 1966), 10-31.

over a period of time. One such study by Carpenter and Greenhill²⁵ used a pre-test and a post-test to determine attitude change during the progress of several televised courses. They found that there was no substantial change in students' attitudes regarding the medium. In contrast to these findings, Macomber and others²⁶ conducted a similar study and found that students became unfavorable toward televised instruction after a period of time. Studies by Klapper²⁷ and Pollack²⁸ supported the negative attitude findings of Macomber. In still another similar study, Reid²⁹ found his subjects more favorable toward T.V. after a period of time.

A study conducted by Firnberg³⁰ was concerned with the opinions of students and faculty relative to the use of closed circuit television for teaching selected courses. Students felt that the most effective aspects of television were that it was easier to see and hear, and the

²⁵C. R. Carpenter and L. P. Greenhill, Instructional Television Research Project Number One: An Investigation of CCTV of Teaching University Courses. (U. Park: The Pennsylvania State, July 31, 1955), 48-49.

²⁶F. G. Macomber, et al., "Experimental Study in Instructional Procedures." (Oxford, Ohio: Miami University, Oct. 1, 1956), pp. 34-37.

²⁷Hope Lunin Klapper, Closed Circuit Television as a Medium of Instruction at New York University 1956-57. (New York: New York U, 1958), pp. 31-35.

²⁸Thomas Clark Pollack, et. al., Closed Circuit Television as a Medium of Instruction 1955-56. (New York: New York U., Oct. 1956), p. 22.

²⁹J. Christopher Reid, "An Experimental Study of a Comparison of Content Learned, Attitude Toward Subject Matter, and Attitude Toward Instructional T.V. of Students in a Public Speaking Course Presented by T.V. and Face-to-Face Methods," (paper prepared for Speech 300, Problems, University of Missouri, Columbia, 1960).

³⁰James W. Firnberg, "An Evaluation of Closed Circuit Television as Used in Teaching Selected Courses at Louisiana State University," (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Louisiana State University, 1969.)

visual aids were better. It was further found that most students tested felt that television instruction was at least as good as regular large group instruction. Their overall reaction to closed-circuit televised instruction was neutral. A comparison of achievement of those who were instructed by television to those who were in a conventional classroom showed that there was no significant difference.

McDaniel and Filiatreau³¹ conducted a study which was to investigate student attitudes toward television teaching. They found that students favored conventional teaching. Both groups, those who were instructed by television and those who were instructed in the conventional classroom, did not differ in achievement. They concluded that acceptability of television instruction is less related to the medium itself than to such factors as the techniques employed by the person teaching the course and the course content presented. The majority of the students used in this study were freshmen.

At best, more research needs to be done in the area of televised instruction before conclusive statements can be made. The literature does not support a theory of attitude change toward televised instruction as yet as too many variables have been left unaccounted for. For the present study, it was important to know if the medium would interfere with the findings. In this area, it can be concluded that attitude change takes place only over a period of time; students' opinions of televised instruction vary according to subject matter and method; and comprehension is not affected by the medium. It does not seem likely that the medium itself should have any effect on the findings of the present investigation.

³¹Ernest McDaniel and William K. Filiatreau, "A Comparison of Television and Conventional Instruction as Determinants of Attitude Change," The Journal of Educational Research, LVIII (March, 1965), 293-297.

III. THE METHOD

Design of the Experiment

Primary Experimental Hypotheses to be Tested

The hypotheses to be tested in the present study are stated in the null in the following manner:

- Hypothesis 1. a. The introduction which may precede a speech has no effect on audience attitude toward the source.
- b. The introduction which may precede a speech has no effect on audience attitude toward the topic.
- Hypothesis 2. a. The question period which may follow a speech has no effect on audience attitude toward the source.
- b. The question period which may follow a speech has no effect on audience attitude toward the topic.
- Hypothesis 3. a. There are no significant effects on audience attitude toward the source attributable to an interaction between the introduction to a speech and the question period.
- b. There are no significant effects on audience attitude toward the topic attributable to an interaction between the introduction to a speech and the question period.

Principle Study

In order to test the primary experimental hypotheses, all possible combinations of variables were handled in a 3 x 3 factorial design. Figure 1 diagrams the basic design for a 3 x 3 analysis of variance.

This experimental design permitted the measurement of non-artistic ethos on three levels, high, low, and none (no introduction), and the measurement of the question period on three levels, high, low, and none. The nine cells plus a control group for an initial estimate of sample attitude provide all possible combinations of the independent variables. Each cell received treatment as shown in Figure 2.

Testing for Credibility Proneness

In the previous studies on ethos examined by the writer, no experimenters tested for credibility proneness in their subjects. If credibility proneness is a significant factor in the communication process, as has been suggested by Seigel, Miller, and Wotring,¹ the experimenter must know to what degree his subjects are credibility prone in order to analyze adequately the results of ethos treatments. Heretofore, experimenters have measured source credibility by using subjects whose ability to perceive level of perception of credibility was unknown. Fiedler² first developed the concept of Assumed Similarity between Opposites, and his work was expanded by Seigel, Miller and Wotring.³ For a subject to be considered high in his ability to perceive differences in source credibility, he would score high on the Assumed Similarity between Opposites, (ASO) scale. This means that his actual

¹ Elliot R. Seigel, Gerald R. Miller and C. Edward Wotring, "Source Credibility and Credibility Proneness A New Relationship," Speech Monographs, XXXVI (June, 1969), 188-225.

² Fred Fiedler, "The Leader's Psychological Distance and Group Effectiveness," in Dorwin Cartwright and Alvin Zander, eds., Group Dynamics (2nd ed.; Evanston, Ill., 1960), pp. 586-606.

³ Elliot R. Seigel, Gerald R. Miller and C. Edward Wotring, loc. cit.

Cell	Non-Artistic Ethos	Question Period	Abbreviation
1 1	High	Good	HG
1 2	High	Bad	HB
1 3	High	None	HN
2 1	Low	Good	LG
2 2	Low	Bad	LB
2 3	Low	None	LN
3 1	None	Good	NG
3 2	None	Bad	NB
3 3	None	None	S
9 9	None	None	N

Fig. 2.--Combinations of treatments of independent variables.

ASO is low, or that the similarity that he sees between sources which vary in credibility is low. The converse is true for individuals who do not perceive differences in source credibility. A method was devised to test subjects in the present study on this variable.

Method

Subjects. The subjects for this part of the study were two hundred and forty-one students taking Speech for Business and Professional People at Louisiana State University during the Spring semester, 1970. Because the Assumed Similarity between Opposites device was used as a screening device for subjects for the main part of the experiment, these subjects were intended to be the same as those used in subsequent parts of the study.

Procedure. On the first day of class of the Spring semester, which was three weeks before the main part of the experiment was to commence, the experimenter administered the Assumed Similarity between Opposites measuring instrument. This instrument assesses receiver perceptions of most acceptable and least acceptable sources of messages. Subjects were first told that they were taking part in a study conducted by a member of the speech instructional staff and were introduced to the experimenter. The experimenter then instructed the subjects in completing the semantic differential-type scales by reading a set of instructions and having the subjects follow along on their own set of instructions (see Appendix A). The experimenter further explained that no one should turn pages in the test booklet until told to do so. Pages were not turned until every member of the experimental group had completed the page being worked on.

The first set of scales which appeared on page one of the booklet

was preceded with the statement: "How we think about those with whom we communicate is very important. Think of the person who is most acceptable to you as a communicator. This may be someone you have known in the past, or someone you know now."⁴ The subjects were then instructed to complete that set of scales only and wait for further instructions. Upon completion of the first page, subjects were told to turn to page two and follow the printed instructions, which read "Rate each person on the scales below his name." The names Neil Armstrong, George Wallace, Chet Huntley, Johnny Carson and Lyndon Johnson appeared on the page with six, seven-choice bi-polar scales following each name. The scales were of the ethos type, loaded heavily with elements of authoritativeness and character. These scales were not an integral part of the experiment but were used as a distraction between the high credibility and low credibility ASO measures. Following the specific communicator scales was the last set of scales, which was preceded by the statement "Now think of the person who is least acceptable to you as a communicator. This may be someone you have known in the past, or someone you know now." Subjects were then instructed to complete this set of scales (see Appendix A).

While it has been shown that the ASO instrument does measure differences in perception of credibility in individuals, the precise implications of such differences as they affect the communication situation are unclear. Moreover, the question of frequency of high ASO individuals (i.e., individuals who are not credibility prone) within a population has some bearing on whether it is necessary to test for this variable at all. Not knowing the importance of ASO scores, it was impossible to

⁴Ibid.

TABLE I. Group means, ranges and within group variances of ten randomly selected groups from the Business Speech Population, on the Assumed Similarity between Opposites test

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Mean	15.1	14.8	14.4	15.3	15.8	14.2	14.4	16.5	15.1	14.4
Range	7.9-24.9	7.8-21.9	7.5-22.2	8.8-23.0	6.1-23.9	7.0-25.1	6.8-20.4	9.7-26.8	8.9-22.7	7.8-23.0
Variance	14.94	19.40	18.75	13.43	21.26	17.86	24.21	15.02	12.03	19.29

use them for the present experiment in any way other than as a screening device. In this manner, the experimenter could be relatively sure that there was not a significant number of subjects in his experimental group who could not discern differences in credibility.

Results and Discussion

Each treatment group was handled separately so that if any group scores were high ASO, they could be replaced with other groups. Table I presents group means, ranges and variances calculated for each group using the scoring procedure as described by Fiedler.⁵ This procedure involves scoring each scale on the first semantic differential, using numbers from one to seven and finding the difference from each corresponding scale on the second semantic differential. The difference is then squared and summed. Finally, a D score is obtained by taking the square root of this sum.

As a screening procedure, it was necessary for all treatment groups to have homogeneous variance on the ASO measure. To assure homogeneity, Bartlett's Test for homogeneity of variance was computed.⁶ This test compares within group variance of different groups, looking for significant differences between groups. The result of Bartlett's Test is read as a χ^2 . With the ten groups tested, the χ^2 was 18.74 with 9 degrees of freedom. This result was significant at the .05 level, the χ^2 value at this level being 16.9 with 9 degrees of freedom. This meant that there were significant differences among the variances of

⁵Fiedler, loc. cit.

⁶Allen L. Edwards, Experimental Design in Psychological Research (Rev. ed., New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1960), p. 108.

the ten randomly selected groups and that credibility proneness apparently was a significant source of variation. Next, the experimenter isolated the group with the greatest within-group variance and applied Bartlett's Test for homogeneity of variance with the remaining nine groups. It was found that the nine groups were homogeneous, the χ^2 now being 13.81 with 8 degrees of freedom ($\chi^2_{.05} \cong 15.5$). The next step was randomly to select another single group to test for ASO and to test for homogeneity of variance of that group with the other nine homogeneous groups. It was found subsequently that the ten treatment groups were homogeneous, χ^2 being 8.57 with 9 degrees of freedom. Table II presents the ASO analysis with the new tenth group. This new result was considerably less than significant. Table III presents the results of Bartlett's Test along with χ^2 values of significance. With a homogeneity of variance obtained for all ten groups, the experimenter was assured that there would be little or no influence from the credibility proneness variable on the credibility treatments.

Materials and Measuring Instruments

Measuring Instruments

Semantic Differential. The semantic differential measuring instrument was selected for the present study because it has been shown to be a superior technique for measuring attitude when ego-involvement has been controlled as a variable.⁷ As Andersen and Clevenger have pointed out in their survey of experimental research in ethos, the

⁷Charles E. Osgood, George J. Suci, and Percy H. Tannenbaum, The Measurement of Meaning (Urbana, Ill.: University of Illinois Press, 1957), p. 192.

TABLE II. Analysis of Group Assumed Similarity between Opposites, or ASO scores, on the credibility factor of the semantic differential

Treatment Group	HG	HB	HN	LG	LB	LN	NG	NB	S	N
Mean	15.1	14.8	14.4	15.3	15.8	14.2	14.4	16.5	15.1	14.4
Range	7.9-24.9	7.8-21.9	7.5-22.2	8.8-23.0	6.1-23.1	7.0-25.1	6.8-20.4	9.7-26.8	8.9-22.7	7.8-23.0
Variance	14.94	19.40	18.75	13.43	21.26	17.86	15.16	15.02	12.03	19.29

TABLE III. Analysis of Homogeneity of Variance Scores and Levels of Significance on the χ^2

	χ^2	d.f.	$\chi^2_{.05}$
Original 10 groups	18.74*	9	16.9
Nine groups	13.81	8	15.5
With new 10th group	8.57	9	16.9

* $P < .05$

semantic differential has been frequently used in research in ethos and has been successful in assessing one or more of the aspects of ethos.⁸

McCroskey, in a more recent report on the measurement of ethos, concluded that the semantic differential is highly capable of measuring ethos, either initial or terminal, on two factors or dimensions: character and authoritativeness.⁹

A twenty item, seven choice semantic differential scale was constructed for use as a post-treatment test of attitude toward the speaker. Scales used to measure the authoritativeness dimension of ethos were reliable-unreliable, informed-uninformed, valuable-worthless, qualified-unqualified, expert-inexpert, experienced-inexperienced, intelligent-unintelligent, and trained-untrained. Scales used to assess the character dimension of ethos were honest-dishonest, nice-awful, friendly-unfriendly, pleasant-unpleasant, virtuous-sinful, confident-unsure, mature-immature, energetic-tired, frank-secretive, just-unjust, easygoing-quick-tempered, modest-boastful (see Appendix A).¹⁰ To eliminate any possible set response, the positive and negative ends of the bi-polar scales were alternated. For scoring purposes, the steps of each scale were assigned a value from 1 (positive) to 7 (negative). Each dimension of ethos was scored separately so that subjects had two scores on the ethos semantic differential, one for authoritativeness and one for character of the speaker.

A similar three-item, seven-choice semantic differential was

⁸Andersen and Clevenger, op. cit., p. 78.

⁹James C. McCroskey, "Scales for the Measurement of Ethos," Speech Monographs, XXXIII (1966), 70.

¹⁰Ibid., p. 72.

constructed to assess subjects' attitudes toward the topic. The evaluative terms used were the bi-polar adjectives good-bad, valuable-worthless, and wise-foolish.¹¹ For scoring purposes, the steps of each scale were similarly assigned values of 1 to 7, the positive adjective always being closest to 1. A single mean score of attitude toward the topic was therefore obtainable.

Development of Independent Variables

By the hypotheses, our interest is directed toward the question period and the three levels of non-artistic ethos as independent variables in the present study.

The independent variables of this experiment were three levels of non-artistic ethos and three levels of the question period. The three levels of non-artistic ethos required that two different introductions of the speaker be constructed, one with high ethos and one with low ethos. The three levels of the question period required that two complete question periods be constructed, one containing elements of high or good ethos and the other low or bad ethos elements. This section will describe the construction and handling of each of these independent variables in detail.

Construction of the Introductions

The non-artistic ethical appeal of a speaker as defined by Aristotle is any proof existing beforehand and not supplied by the speaker himself. An introduction of a speaker would therefore fall into this

¹¹Kenneth K. Sereno, "Ego-Involvement, High Source Credibility, and Response to a Belief-Discrepant Communication," Speech Monographs, XXXV (Nov., 1969), 478.

category. Since the earliest studies on ethos, one means employed to establish the speaker's image non-artistically is to create fictitious speakers by telling the audience that they are going to hear a speech delivered by someone other than the actual speaker. The present study did not create fictitious speakers but rather presented a real person in two different lights.

The introduction designed to present the speaker as a low credible source consisted of identifying the speaker as Howard Dorgan, a student at Louisiana State University. In order to establish his lack of expertise in the subject area of his speech, the introduction described him as having merely "something to say." A complete text of the low ethos introduction may be found in Appendix B. The high ethos introduction had a formal tone throughout. It introduced the speaker as Mr. Howard Dorgan, a doctoral candidate at Louisiana State University who had distinguished himself in maintaining straight A's in all of his graduate work. Mr. Dorgan was further accredited with several publications and the experience of having taught college for several years. A complete text of the high ethos introduction appears in Appendix B.

Results and Discussion

Haiman's initial study on ethos used similar introductions where the speaker was a student in the low ethos situation and a graduate student in the high ethos situation and found a significant difference in the audience's attitude toward the speaker.¹²

¹²Franklyn S. Haiman, "An Experimental Study of the Effects of Ethos in Public Speaking," Speech Monographs, XVI (Sept., 1949), 190-202.

Construction of the Speech

Only one version of the speech was constructed as the speech remained a constant in the present study. Overall construction of the speech was aimed at producing as neutral an effect as possible with regard to ethos.

Ego Involvement

All subjects in the study were tested for ego involvement on three possible topics. This was done to assure a lack of ego involvement on the topic to be used for the speech. When ego involvement exists, attitude change is usually inhibited, and clearly a new set of variables must be taken into account.¹³ Therefore, at the same time the ASO scales were administered, the experimenter presented subjects with a three scale seven choice semantic differential for each of three topics. The scales were of the evaluative type, employing the terms good-bad, valuable-worthless, wise-foolish (see Appendix A). Subjects were instructed to place an X on the scale position corresponding most closely to their own, an A on the positions with which they also agree, and a U on the positions with which they did not agree. The test is scored by summing the number of A's and X's for each topic. Scores may range from three to twenty-one, the higher numbers indicating lower levels of ego-involvement. Table IV presents the raw scores of a random sample of twenty-two subjects from the Speech for Business and Professional People population tested for ego involvement on the three topics. Examination of the table shows a high level of involvement with the issue of the voting age, a low level of involvement with the issue of reduced

¹³Kenneth K. Sereno, loc. cit.

TABLE IV. Raw scores of ego-involvement

Topic	Scores																						Total
Voting																							
Age	5	5	7	7	6	3	7	8	4	6	3	9	8	6	9	8	6	8	8	9	6	8	146
Foreign																							
Aid	7	9	5	9	6	21	6	7	6	9	5	9	12	6	3	9	6	7	8	9	7	8	174
Federal																							
Aid to																							
Cities	4	8	3	7	9	21	6	8	8	9	5	10	9	6	9	8	8	5	7	9	9	8	176

foreign aid, and a still lower level of involvement with the issue of increased aid to cities. The topic related to increased aid to cities was selected for use in the present study.

Elements exhibiting the speaker's good will, for example, were absent from the speech. There was no introduction included to be given by the speaker, and no special attempt was made to establish any kind of rapport with the audience. The speech merely began with content material leading up to the main proposition. Although the speech presented new information on the topic, there was no other attempt to add to or detract from the speaker's ethos in the text of the speech. The speech gave no indication of the speaker's involvement or experience with the topic. The language used in the speech contained no technical terms which might lead an audience to believe that the speaker was an expert in the area of the subject, nor any slang expressions nor particularly vague statements which might detract from the speaker's ethos. The length of the speech was 793 words and took seven minutes and fifteen seconds to deliver. It was a speech to persuade the audience to promote more federal aid to the cities (see Appendix B for complete text of the speech). The speech was recorded on video tape.

Construction of the Question Periods

The second independent variable in the present study was the question period. The experimenter controlled this variable by devising question periods, one good and the other bad. In the present study, the question period is defined as a function of the speaker, that is, a good question period consisted of answers by the speaker which contained elements of high ethos, while a bad question period consisted of answers by the speaker which contained elements of low ethos.

During the semester prior to the experiment, survey forms were distributed to fourteen members of the speech faculty at Louisiana State University. These forms were accompanied by a cover letter explaining that the experimenter was trying to assess qualities exhibited by the speaker which should lead him to success in a question period and qualities which should lead him to failure (see Appendix B for complete letter). The survey form contained two categories of techniques a speaker might use in a question period which were tentatively labeled good or bad. The form asked for agreement or disagreement on these qualities, for explanations of disagreements, as well as for further qualities that the faculty member might wish to include.

The techniques listed on the survey form were the result of extensive investigation of over forty text books in the area of speech. Only two texts were found to contain any advice on speaker performance in the question period. These two were Public Speaking: The Essentials by Waldo W. Braden, and Alan H. Monroe's Principles and Types of Speech. The texts offered some limited material on speaker replies to questions. Drawing from these sources, the survey form was constructed for purposes of trying to determine the characteristics of a good and bad question period. Of the fourteen forms distributed, ten were returned to the experimenter. From the suggestions of this panel of experts, the question periods were constructed. The guidelines given to the experimenter for construction of the good question period were directed toward providing the speaker with answers which:

1. Demonstrated an eagerness on the part of the speaker to have questions from the listeners.
2. Answered all questions fairly and honestly.
3. Treated the questioner with fairness and courtesy even when

the questions seem to be irrelevant.

4. Expressed appreciation for a good question by complimenting the questioner.

5. Presented additional information to the audience related to the question at hand.

6. Repeated the question to allow all members of the audience to hear it and to assure speaker understanding of the question.

7. Connected what is said in the answer to what had already been said.

8. Drew a conclusion from material presented in the answer.

9. Showed an awareness of why questions were asked.

10. If valid objections were made, modified the stand already taken in the answer.

11. Used humor.

12. Admitted ignorance when certain answers were not known.

13. Stated where certain information could be found.

14. Helped listeners phrase their questions or paraphrased a question for clarity.

The guidelines for construction of the bad question period were directed toward providing the speaker with answers which:

1. Dismissed or ridiculed poor questions.

2. Lectured listeners on what they should and should not know and about what they should ask questions.

3. Were evasive.

4. Were refusals to answer questions on specific things.

5. Anticipated what the question is before the questioner had a chance to finish.

The question periods were constructed as definitive types, the good question period being very good and the bad question period being very bad. For purposes of verification, an audio tape of each question period was made and played to members of the speech faculty. All eight faculty members who listened to the re-play confirmed that the question periods were of the intended type. The final question put to the faculty after each question period was played was, "By virtue of this question period alone, how would you rate the speaker with regard to ethos?" There was no disagreement among faculty members.

Following is a justification of each of the questions and answers as each is analyzed for content.

Good Question Period

Question

You're pushing for more federal aid to cities when it seems to me that the federal government is already doing a great deal to help. How much do you want them to do without taking over the cities completely?

Answer

Your question, then, is basically "Isn't the federal government doing enough already?" is that a fair restatement? O.K. Let me reiterate some of the points that I covered already and relate them for you. First of all, the 11 per cent rise in the crime rate was a 1969 figure; second, the 4 per cent unemployed (three million plus people) was a late 1969 figure; third, the National Mayors' Convention which advised a need for 50 billion dollars for New York City alone was the last mayors' convention. The point is, these deplorable situations exist even after present federal aid. Now let me tell you what else the mayors'

convention told the sub-committee on urban affairs: in New York City alone, two million people live in poverty; one out of every four schools is over fifty years old; one quarter of all housing is sub-standard; of the city's total budget, 14 per cent or 650 million dollars is spent on welfare. No, I'd have to say that present federal aid is not enough.

This question was included in the good question period as being representative of one with poor wording as well as unthinking content. The questioner is somewhat uninformed as to what the federal government is really doing and asks the question from emotion as well as ignorance. Here the speaker has a chance to show his skills in handling a poor question without discrediting the questioner. The speaker first offers a restatement of the question for several reasons: he can re-word the question into more specific terminology for a clearer understanding by the audience; he can ask the questioner if he (the speaker) has understood the question and has offered a restatement of exactly what the questioner had in mind, thereby hoping to win a potentially hostile questioner; he can voice the question again to be certain that everyone in the audience heard what it was. Next, the speaker begins to work toward the conclusion that federal aid, at present, is not enough. He adds significance to the figures already stated and presents new information related to what was already said. He shows that he has this new information at his finger tips, hoping to give the impression that he is thoroughly informed on his topic. He answers the question directly by utilization of statistics which lead him to the conclusion that federal aid at present is not adequate. With regard to the directives by the faculty for construction of a successful question period (see Appendix B), the present question and answer demonstrate numbers 2, 3, 4, 8, 11 and 13 (see Appendix B), additional information is presented;

the question is re-phrased; a conclusion is drawn which answers the question; the information presented in the answer is related to the information already presented; the questioner is treated with courtesy and fairness even though the question is poor.

Question

You mentioned federal aid with no strings attached. What do you mean?

Answer

Thank-you. This is an important question. If the federal government insists on giving aid only if it has the say-so about how and where it will be spent, the situation might be no better than before. The cities themselves should be allowed to determine their own priorities. In fact, Melvin Laird has told us that the situation in the Watts area of Los Angeles, for example, is much different from the situation in New York's Harlem. The point is obvious - the cities themselves know what they need. I have a quote from Roger A. Freeman that I'd like to bring in here. Now, Roger A. Freeman is the Senior Staff Member of the Hoover Institute on War, Revolution and Peace and he has stated: "Some of the major programs have resulted in failures which would not have occurred, at least not on such a scale, if the state and local governments had been free to act autonomously." So we must urge for federal aid with no strings attached.

In the speech, the speaker merely mentioned the phrase "no strings attached." With the present information-seeking question at hand, the speaker becomes aware of his failure to fully explain the concept and thus, thanks the questioner thereby complimenting him for a good question. In this question and answer, directives 2 and 12 are

demonstrated: the questioner is complimented for a good question; additional information is presented.

Question

There has been a lot of talk about too much federal intervention already. Is more of this government intervention really good?

Answer

You're probably asking this question in light of all of the criticism leveled at the federal government for trying to control the states - and I think that there is valid support for more aid inspite of this criticism. Let me quote Arthur Nataflin, Mayor of Minneapolis: "Critics often insist that federal intervention is destroying local initiative. They should spend some time visiting the endless meetings of the advisory committees of citizens who have worked for many months on these studies. They would see that rather than an opposition of federal rule, there has been a liberating of local energies . . . It should be emphasized at this point that programs are locally conceived, developed, approved and managed. And the critics of federal aid should know that the alternative is not more local control but rather less; without the grant programs, there would probably be, if anything, direct federal action." Of course, not all federal money is being managed locally and that's why I'm advocating, in this case, for federal money with no strings attached.

The questioner poses a question with hidden meaning which probably reflects the thoughts of a large number of those in the audience. Here the speaker shows a cognizance of those feelings and exhibits directives 1 and 2. He indicates an acute awareness of the reason for the question; presents new information in the form of quotations from

an authority; recognizes a slight loop-hole in what the authority has to say and uses it to his advantage as he related to another point that he has already made. Overall, the speaker handles a challenge to his position in an authoritative and friendly manner.

Question

How much money is being allocated by the federal government to help the cities already?

Answer

I should know the answer to this but I don't - - - I didn't bring those figures with me.

Question

I have a feeling that it's a little more than chicken feed, don't you?

Answer

Yes, the chickens could feed for a long time on the money already being given to the cities. But the point is, PEOPLE can't exist. I believe that you can find those figures in a recent issue of the American City.

One directive given the experimenter by the speech staff was that the speaker should admit ignorance when he does not have an answer to a specific question in order to uphold his favorable ethos. Another directive was that the speaker should state where certain information can be found if he cannot provide that information himself. In this answer, the speaker displays both of these good points. He is honest in his answer and provides a source for the questioner. Further, in the interchange between questioner and speaker, the speaker offers some humor. Humor was directive number 10, leading toward a successful question

period. In this particular instance, the humor came at a time when a hostile response from the speaker could have been forthcoming. Humor as an answer to hostility will more than likely produce a favorable response toward the speaker.

Question

Let's go back to the "no strings attached" issue. Why can't the federal government set up local agencies to control the funds? By this I mean - federal people set up on the cities. It seems to me that this would prevent the mis-use of funds on the local level and, give the federal people the control they want while at the same time get the money to the cities.

Answer

Perhaps I should have brought up the fears of graft and corruption of local officials myself. I know that many of you probably have visions of local officials becoming personally wealthy by virtue of Federal money. Let me say that corruption exists, but no more so on local levels than right in the federal government. The cities have to control their own funds. A vivid example is that of a Florida city that ended up with a boardwalk instead of a badly needed swimming pool in a poverty area because some brain from Washington decided that this was what was needed. Back to your question - why spend funds on establishing local offices when that same money can be put to good use by helping solve the city problems - - -

In this question, there is implied fear of graft and corruption which would impede help to the cities. In his answer, the speaker shows cognizance of that fear, admits the basis for it, and offers his solution as the best answer to the problem. Again, the speaker handles himself

well in view of a partial threat to his position. By publicly declaring that his speech should have covered the point in question, he probably increases his favorable image.

Question

You said that the only way to lower the crime rate was by having more police - and you used quotes from Milton Eisenhower and someone else to support this. I strongly disagree. We don't want a police state! I think that if people are more careful about where they go and about who they let into their homes, and if there were more burglar alarms and cameras and the like and better lighting in downtown areas and around buildings - - And, stiffer penalties for criminals, the rate would drop. Statistics show that a large number of criminals have a long record of arrests for the same kinds of things. Let's lock them up for good, not turn this country into a police state!!

Answer

I think your point is well taken. You could be right about other methods being just as effective as more police. At any rate, money would still be needed to make the necessary changes in lighting and so forth. I wasn't advocating a police state by any means. And I'm with you 100 per cent. If there is another way to lower the crime rate, then I'm for it!

In this final question and answer of the good question period, the speaker listens to a fairly well thought-out objection to his stand of increasing the police force. He compliments the questioner for his question and, realizing that the objection might be valid, adjusts his stand in light of the questioner's comments. Directives 5 and 12 related to these answers. Modifying one's stand in light of valid

objections was a directive from the speech faculty, as well as complimenting the questioner for a well-put question.

It should be noted that the speaker projected an air of friendliness throughout the good question period. His expressions reflected concern for his audience as did his general tone.

Bad Question Period

Question

You're pushing for more federal aid to cities when it seems to me that the federal government is already doing a great deal to help. How much do you want them to do without taking over the cities completely?

Answer

Apparently you just weren't paying attention to my speech. You missed the whole point. Now if anyone has anything pertinent to ask, I'll be glad to answer it.

The questioner does show a lack of perception with his question, and as the speaker points out in his response, he did miss the whole point of the speech. The speaker is guilty of being discourteous, however, and refusal to do other than ridicule a poor question shows an unfairness toward the questioner on the part of the speaker. Directive one, with regard to a bad question period, related to this answer.

Question

Well, I have something to say. My name is Bob Neely and I have done a lot of research on this subject. It happens that we have been considering the question of federal aid to cities for some time and I'm amazed over the lack of information that you seem to have on this issue.

Do you know how many programs are in operation by the federal government to help the cities? For your information, there are over 250. Do you know how much money is spent each year on urban areas? Fourteen and a half billion dollars a year!! Let me give you some more of the programs already in effect and how much is being spent: relief, 3.6 billion; poverty war, 1.6 billion; regional development, 4.4 billion; some more of the programs are: aid to education; crime prevention; rent subsidies; teacher corps; pollution; housing; urban renewal; mass transit, and there are still more. You asked for a pertinent question - here it is! How can you talk about increasing federal aid to cities when you don't even have any figures on what is being done right now?

Answer

Thanks . . . Let me have the next question.

The questioner, in this case, shows superior knowledge in the subject area and asks valid questions which are pertinent to the issue at hand. The speaker shows disdain for the questioner and totally disregards the questions. The speaker's knowledge about his subject is placed in jeopardy as he abruptly shuts off the questioner (see Appendix B).

Question

You mentioned federal aid with no strings attached. What I want to know is . . .

Answer

. . . why should the federal government give aid to the cities without maintaining control of the pocketbook? The answer is obvious; the federal government doesn't know what the cities need as well as the cities do. The question you should ask is "How can the federal aid best

be doled out to the cities?" and the answer is "free and clear, so that cities can act autonomously."

Question

Well, if you didn't interrupt me, that was the question I started to ask!

Answer

Okay!

This interchange demonstrates directives 2 and 5 given to the experimenter by the speech faculty with regard to characteristics of a poor question period as a function of the speaker. First, the speaker interrupts the questioner. This is not only a lack of courtesy on the part of the speaker, but serves as a possible deterrent for questions from others. The response by the questioner underscores the interruption for the audience. Tied in with the interruption is another characteristic of a poor question period; anticipation by the speaker of what the question is going to be. It is one thing to help the questioner phrase his question for purposes of clarity and understanding, and quite another to take the floor completely away from him, anticipating his question, and thereby placing him in an inferior position. The last characteristic exemplified here is the lecture which the speaker gives to the questioner on what question he should ask. All of these characteristics would probably tend to shut off further questions and influence the attitudes of the audience toward the speaker, which is the primary hypothesis.

Question

There has been a lot of talk about too much federal intervention already. Is more federal intervention really good?

Answer

I don't think it's really bad - what do you think? Wouldn't you rather have federal dollars floating around than all of the big city problems hitting you in the face? That's the trouble with all of you people who holler "federal intervention." You don't know a good thing when you see it!

Here the speaker begs the question by shifting the burden of proof to the questioner and exhibiting directives 1 and 3. The question reflects the opinions of a large number of people, however, the speaker chooses to ridicule them instead of trying to justify his own position. The speaker's answer is evasive as he does not answer the question; he merely insults the questioner and those who subscribe to the same views.

Question

Will taxes go up as federal aid to cities increases?

Answer

Will taxes go up? Well, that's hard to say. Taxes are always going up. Who's to say whether increased aid to cities is one of the reasons. Some budgets get cut - others get increased. I think Nixon's been doing a fine job so far - - with taxes.

This question is a fair question on a very important aspect of the speaker's proposition. The speaker is again evasive, offering no new information and not really answering the question.

Question

How much federal aid to cities is lost through graft and corruption of city officials?

Answer

I don't have any figures on that . . . I don't want to get into it.

This question poses a hostile threat to the speaker's position on his topic. Graft and corruption exists and the speaker should deal with fears in that regard. He chooses to shut off his questioner by refusing to answer the question or even talk about the issue. By use of the phrase "I don't want to get into it," the speaker implies that he knows that graft and corruption does exist, but he does not answer the question or suggest where the answer could be found.

Question

Back to the question on taxes. Your answer was about as evasive as any I've heard in a long time. Of courses taxes will go up as federal spending increases. Why don't you tell the truth?

Answer

Well, there is a good change that taxes will go up - - I guess.

This interchange points up the evasive quality of the speaker's answers. The questioner, in effect, is challenging the truthfulness of the speaker's answers. By now admitting that taxes might go up, the speaker puts himself in a precarious position. His reluctant tone does not enhance his rapport.

Question

You said that the only way to lower the crime rate was by having more police. And you used quotes from Milton Eisenhower and someone else to support this point. I strongly disagree. We don't want a police state! I think that if people are more careful about where they go and

about who they let into their homes - - and if there were more burglar alarms and cameras and the like - and better lighting in downtown areas and around buildings; and stiffer penalties for criminals, the rate would drop. Statistics show that a large number of criminals have a long record of arrests for the same kinds of things. Let's lock them up for good, not have a police state!!

Answer

It's interesting that you think you know more than Milton Eisenhower and others who have studied this problem for years. It always tickles me that whenever anyone says "increase the police force," you get some reactionary like you who yells "police state." All you want to do is overcrowd our prisons with small-time thieves. We spend millions on the prisons already; let's prevent crime, not wait until it happens before we do anything.

The questioner presents some well-thought-out ideas for the speaker's consideration. Instead of either supporting his own position or granting some concessions to the questioner, the speaker reacts emotionally to the question, insulting the questioner and getting angry for what he thinks is a poor question.

Question

Mr. Dorgan, let me ask you a question which I think is basic to this whole issue. If the federal government were to do no more than they are already doing - of course taking into account all of Nixon's expansion programs, do you still think that increased federal aid would be necessary?

Answer

I don't know!

In this last interchange, the questioner challenges the speaker's whole premise. The question is well-timed as the progression of questions and answers has placed the speaker in a dangerous situation with regard to credibility. The speaker has no answer for this question, thereby admitting total defeat. He cannot offer any additional support or reasons why his position should be accepted and crumbles under fire.

It should be added here that the speaker did much himself, in the way of delivery, to enhance the poor quality desired in the bad question period. The experimenter coached the speaker beforehand on such things as tone of voice, use of gestures, and use of facial expressions. Wherever possible, these mechanical elements of delivery were used to promote negative effects. Such things as condescending tones, stabbing gestures and frowns at questioners were used throughout the bad question period. The speaker tried to appear noticeably annoyed with the questions. These negative actions persisted as the speaker participated in the bad question period.

Selection of the Speaker

Since the entire speaking situation was written for the speaker, including the questions and the answers, the most important consideration in selecting a speaker was to find someone capable of presenting rehearsed material in a spontaneous manner. The person selected was a male doctoral student in Public Address who was in his middle thirties and who had had considerable experience in both speaking before groups and in acting. He was rehearsed both on and off camera to assure a spontaneous presentation under the experimental conditions. Further, because the use of prompting cards was necessary for the study, the speaker was rehearsed while using the cards. He demonstrated an ability to present

his portion of the speaking situation in a spontaneous manner.

In addition to being able to deliver the speech and the answers to questions in a spontaneous manner, the speaker had to qualify as a person who could fit both the high ethos introduction and the low ethos introduction which were intended for use in the present study. The speaker selected did fit both levels of introduction.

Selection of the Questioners

Those persons selected to ask questions were students enrolled in Speech 66, Discussion and Conference Speaking, at Louisiana State University, and Dr. J. Donald Ragsdale, the director of this study. They were not contacted until the day they were asked to participate in the experiment and were not given copies of the questions they were going to ask until just prior to the video tape session. They were told that they were going to ask questions to a speaker and that the procedure would be video taped. The students and Dr. Ragsdale were given the option of either using prompting cards which had been previously prepared for each question, or delivering the questions from small index cards or extemporaneously. Care was taken to balance the various types of deliveries so that not too many of the questioners used index cards. In some cases, the index cards were placed inside notebooks which were carried on camera to give a more natural effect. All of the questioners were advised of the importance of achieving a spontaneous effect. Each question was delivered to the experimenter before video taping and some changes in questioners were made in order to achieve maximum spontaneity.

The Main Experiment

While 241 Students were involved in the credibility proneness measure, the experimenter was able to get only 187 students to return for the main part of the experiment.

Subjects

The subjects for the present study were students in sections of Speech 6, Speech for Business and Professional People, at Louisiana State University during the Spring Semester of 1970. The treatment groups varied in size, the smallest group having eighteen students and the largest having twenty-six students. The ten groups used were originally selected at random from the entire Speech 6 population; however, upon analysis of Bartlett's Test for homogeneity of variance with regard to Assumed Similarity between Opposites scores, a new group was substituted for the group with the largest variance. The experimenter did not consider other factors in his selection of subjects. He randomly assigned the groups to the various treatment cells in the 3 X 3 analysis of variance experimental design.

The ten randomly assigned treatments were as follows: Group 1, containing 18 students, was assigned to see the speech preceded by the high ethos introduction and succeeded by the good question period. Group 2, containing 21 students, was assigned to see the speech preceded by the low ethos introduction and succeeded by the bad question period. Group 3, containing 19 students, was assigned to see just the speech followed by the good question period. The 20 students in Group 4 were shown the high ethos introduction followed by the speech and the bad question period. Group 5, with 20 students, saw the speech preceded by the low ethos introduction and followed by the bad question period. The speech succeeded by the bad question period was shown to the 19 students in Group 6. Group 7, containing 26 students, was assigned to see the

high ethos introduction and the speech only. Group 8, with 20 students saw the low ethos introduction and the speech. Treatment Group 9, with 24 students, was assigned to see the speech only, while Group 10, with 22 students, provided the control by only completing the attitude measure toward the topic.

Procedure

The Ten Treatments

The instructors for each section of Speech 6 involved in the experiment were sent letters confirming the dates for video-tape replay. Since the video tape studio was not in the same building in which the classes met, directions for getting to the studio were included in the communication. Each treatment group was scheduled at a different hour and all groups were scheduled between March 2 through March 14. These steps were followed with each group:

1. Prior to the beginning of the class hour, three television monitors were turned on and arranged so that each was clearly visible by the treatment group. The volume was tested on each of the units and a dot pattern was left on the screens until the tape appeared.
2. At the start of the class hour, the experimenter introduced himself to the group. In all cases, the subjects had been introduced to the experimenter once before, on the first day of class when the ASO scales were administered.
3. The subjects were told by the experimenter that they were in the closed-circuit television laboratory where all television courses originate and where what they were about to view had been video taped.
4. The experimenter then told the treatment groups that what they were about to see had been taped before a live audience similar in make-up to themselves. They were told to watch the monitors and refrain from making any comments during the duration of their involvement with the video tape.
5. The specific treatment, which had been cued up on the video tape recorder beforehand, was replayed to the treatment group.

6. Asking for complete silence, the experimenter circulated a packet containing directions for completing the semantic differential, the credibility measure itself and the attitude measure toward the topic (see Appendix A).
7. In each case, because all subjects indicated that they were already familiar with the mechanics of the semantic differential, the experimenter asked the subjects to complete the forms before them immediately.
8. The subjects were given as much time as was required for all to finish completing the forms. The packets were collected and the subjects were thanked for their co-operation. The experimenter told each group that he would visit them once more during the semester and relate to them exactly what their part was in the overall experiment.

The packets were counted and examined, and it was found that every form had been completed correctly. All 187 subjects were usable in the study. It should be noted that several students arrived after the video tape had been started and were not allowed to complete the forms.

The Results

Analysis of the Data

For the primary experimental hypotheses the analysis of variance was chosen to provide an overall test of differences between the effects of the ten treatments. The analysis of variance is used when dealing with the differences between more than two population variances. Use of this test enables the experimenter to make comparisons between the treatment groups and to isolate a particular variable held accountable for the differences. A modified t test was used to enable the experimenter to look at differences between selected pairs of groups when the F ratio of the analysis of variance was found to be significant.

Primary Experimental Hypotheses

Since the primary experimental hypotheses were stated in the null

as they previously appeared, a two-tailed test was used. The two-tailed or two-sided test is always used when there is no prior hypothesis as to the direction of differences. The primary experimental hypotheses in this instance do not indicate a direction for attitude change. Using the F ratio, the region for rejection of the null hypothesis was equal to or beyond the .05 percentile point. Table V presents the least-squares analysis of variance for treatment groups 1-9, on the authoritativeness factor of credibility only. Table VI includes data for the character factor of the credibility measure. Since the F ratio was significant for the introduction and for the question period, both as single sources of variance, the primary experimental hypotheses were generally accepted, leaving the attitude measure of the topic and interaction effects for further analysis.

The difference between treatments was further analyzed by use of a number of t tests. The t test is a logical follow-up when a significant F is obtained. This means that, once there is a positive determination that the variables tested did make a difference beyond an established level of significance, more pertinent data can be obtained from examining specific pairs of treatments. The t test has been recognized as being highly sensitive for testing the differences between two population means. The t test is calculated by dividing the standard error of the difference between the two means into the linear function. Table VII presents comparisons of effects of the levels of the introduction on the authoritativeness factor of the credibility scales. Table VIII presents comparisons of the effects of the levels of introduction on the character factor of the credibility scales. Tables IX and X present comparisons of the levels of the question period on the two factors of

TABLE V. Least squares analysis of variance on authoritativeness factor of credibility

Source of Variation	Source of Squares	d.f.	Mean Squares	F
Ethos (Introduction)	18.30	2	9.15	6.85***
Q.P.	220.93	2	110.47	82.62***
Ethos x Q.P.	12.32	4	3.08	2.31
Error	237.99	178	1.34	
***P < .01				

TABLE VI. Least squares analysis of variance on character factor of credibility

Source of Variation	Source of Squares	d.f.	Mean Squares	F
Ethos (Introduction)	4.74	2	2.37	3.74*
Q.P.	173.96	2	86.98	137.30**
Ethos x Q.P.	5.67	4	1.42	2.24
Error	112.76	178	.63	

*p < .05

**p < .01

TABLE VII. Comparisons of group mean scores of the introduction on the authoritativeness factor of credibility

Hi Ethos Introduction	3.51
Low Ethos Introduction	4.20
Difference (Linear Function)	.69
d.f.	178
<u>t</u>	3.32**
Hi Introduction	3.51
Low Introduction	4.20 ¹
No Introduction	4.15
Difference (Linear Function)	.58 ²
d.f.	178
<u>t</u>	1.60 n.s.

** P < .01

¹As mean scores increase, the effect is negative.

²The linear function is the difference between pairs of groups calculated by the computer using a weighting factor based on the preceding least squares analysis of variance.

TABLE VIII. Comparisons of group mean scores of the introduction on the character factor of credibility

Hi Ethos Introduction	3.68
Low Ethos Introduction	4.03
Difference (Linear Function)	.35
d.f.	178
<u>t</u>	2.46*
Hi Introduction	3.68
Low Introduction	4.03
No Introduction	4.01
Difference (Linear Function)	.29
d.f.	178
<u>t</u>	1.18 n.s.

* $P < .02$

TABLE IX. Comparisons of group mean scores of the question period on the authoritativeness factor of credibility

Good Question Period	3.23
Bad Question Period	5.51
Difference (Linear Function)	2.28
d.f.	178
<u>t</u>	10.65**
Good Question Period	3.23
Bad Question Period	5.51
No Question Period	3.12
Difference (Linear Function)	2.50
d.f.	178
<u>t</u>	7.12**
** P < .01	

TABLE X. Comparisons of group mean scores of the question period on character factor of credibility

Good Question Period	3.19
Bad Question Period	5.29
Difference (Linear Function)	2.10
d.f.	178
<u>t</u>	14.22**
Good Question Period	3.20
Bad Question Period	5.29
No Question Period	3.23
Difference (Linear Function)	2.03
d.f.	178
<u>t</u>	8.42**
** p < .01	

TABLE XI. Comparisons of three levels of introduction with three levels of question period on the authoritativeness factor

High Introduction, Good Q.P.	2.78	High Introduction, Bad Q.P.	4.71
Low Introduction, Good Q.P.	3.60	Low Introduction, Bad Q.P.	5.71
NG	3.32	NB	6.13
Difference (Linear Function)	.25	Difference (Linear Function)	1.84
d.f.	178	d.f.	178
<u>t</u>	0.39	<u>t</u>	2.85**
HG	2.78	HB	4.70
LG	3.59	LB	5.70
Difference (Linear Function)	.81	Difference (Linear Function)	1.00
d.f.	178	d.f.	178
<u>t</u>	2.18*	<u>t</u>	2.74**

* P < .05

** P < .01

TABLE XII. Comparisons of three levels of introduction with three levels of question period on character factor.

High Introduction, Good Q.P.	3.03	High Introduction, Bad Q.P.	4.79
Low Introduction, Good Q.P.	3.37	Low Introduction, Bad Q.P.	5.41
NG	3.20	NB	5.68
Difference (Linear Function)	.00	Difference (Linear Function)	1.17
d.f.	178	d.f.	178
<u>t</u>	.01	<u>t</u>	2.64**
HG	3.02	HB	4.79
LG	3.37	LB	5.40
Difference (Linear Function)	.35	Difference (Linear Function)	.61
d.f.	178	d.f.	178
<u>t</u>	1.36	<u>t</u>	2.45**

** P < .01

TABLE XIII. Least squares analysis of variance for attitude toward topic

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	d.f.	Mean Square	F
Treatments	31.21	9	3.47	2.086*
Error	330.74	199	1.66	
* $P < .05$				

TABLE XIV. Comparisons of selected group means on the attitude measure toward the topic

Group 1	2.17	Group 1	2.17
Group 2	2.81	Group 4	2.55
Group 3	2.05	Group 7	2.01
Group 4	2.55	Group 2	2.81
Group 5	2.05	Group 5	2.05
Group 6	2.17	Group 8	1.97
vs.		vs.	
Group 7	2.01	Group 3	2.05
Group 8	1.97	Group 6	2.17
Group 9	2.58	Group 9	2.58
Difference (Linear Function) .68 ¹		Difference (Linear Function) .07	
d.f.	199	d.f.	199
<u>t</u>	0.58	<u>t</u>	0.06
<hr/>			
Group 1	2.17	Group 1	2.17
Group 2	2.81	Group 4	2.55
Group 3	2.05	Group 7	2.01
vs.		vs.	
Group 4	2.55	Group 2	2.81
Group 5	2.05	Group 5	2.05
Group 6	2.17	Group 8	1.97
Difference (Linear Function) .25		Difference (Linear Function) .10	
d.f.	199	d.f.	199
<u>t</u>	0.35	<u>t</u>	0.14

¹The Linear Function is the difference between the pairs of groups calculated by the computer using a weighting factor based on the preceding least squares analysis of variance.

TABLE XIV (Continued)

Group 1	2.17	Group 4	2.55
Group 2	2.81	Group 5	2.05
vs.		vs.	
Group 3	2.05	Group 6	2.17
Difference (Linear Function)	.87	Difference (Linear Function)	.25
d.f.	199	d.f.	199
<u>t</u>	1.21	<u>t</u>	0.35
<hr/>			
Group 1	2.17	Group 4	2.55
vs.		vs.	
Group 2	2.81	Group 5	2.05
Difference (Linear Function)	.64	Difference (Linear Function)	.50
d.f.	199	d.f.	199
<u>t</u>	1.55	<u>t</u>	1.23
<hr/>			
Group 1	2.17		
Group 2	2.81		
Group 3	2.05		
Group 4	2.55		
Group 5	2.05		
Group 6	2.17		
Group 7	2.01		
Group 8	1.97		
Group 9	2.58		
vs.			
Group 10	3.15		
Difference (Linear Function)	.80		
d.f.	199		
<u>t</u>	3.06*		

* P < .05

credibility. Tables VII and VIII indicate the \underline{t} scores for the introductions on two factors of the credibility measure. Interestingly, there was a difference between the results obtained from the two factors. The authoritativeness scales yielded a significance at the .01 level in the comparison of the high and low ethos introductions. On the character factor, the level of significance was .02 for the same comparison. The inclusion of the introduction was compared with no introduction on both factors. The authoritativeness scales yielded a .02 significance while the character scales yielded a .05. The results indicate that there was a difference between the high and the low introductions, but this difference was slightly greater on the authoritativeness scales. Further, the inclusion of some form of introduction compared with no introduction did not show a great difference on either factor. It can be assumed from these findings that while the high and low ethos introductions produced a difference, the introduction, as an independent variable, did not greatly affect other independent variables.

Tables IX and X indicate the \underline{t} scores for the question period on two factors of the credibility measure. While there was a difference between the two credibility factors, all \underline{t} scores were significant beyond the .01 level. The assumption from the \underline{t} scores is that, on both factors of credibility, the good question period differed greatly from the bad; further, the inclusion of a good or bad question period significantly differed from the exclusion of any question period. The table points up higher collective means for the good and bad question period than for no question period, seeming to imply that no question period rated higher than some question periods. This distortion can probably be accounted for by the high degree of difference between the good and bad question periods as pointed out by the \underline{t} scores. The bad question

period rated so low (a high mean=a low rating) that it offset the good question period. Apparently, a question period does make a difference to a speaker in terms of ethos, and the good question period heavily favors the speaker when compared with the bad question period.

It is apparent from Tables XI and XII that when paired with a good question period, either the high or low introduction effects did not differ significantly from instances where no introduction was used. This was true on both factors on the credibility scales. When paired with a bad question period, however, the inclusion of an introduction was highly significant as compared to the exclusion of an introduction on both scales at the .01 level. When dealing with the good question period, the high and low introductions did not differ on the character scale, but were significant in their differences at the .05 level on the authoritativeness scales. When paired with the bad question period, the differences between the high and low introductions were highly significant at the .01 level. The low ethos introduction produced a lower ethos rating for the speaker on both the character and authoritativeness scales with the bad question period. From this it can be assumed that the good question period overshadows any introduction, high or low, but that a high introduction will favorably affect the speaker's ethos on the authoritativeness scales with a good question period. A high or low introduction does make a difference when dealing with a bad question period, and the low introduction does bring the speaker's ethos down in this regard.

With regard to the topic, the low F ratio indicated that many significant t 's were not to be expected. The F ratio was barely into levels of significance to warrant t tests, however, and these were run. Table XIV shows a comparison of selected group means on the attitude measure

toward the topic. It is evident that attitude change did take place, but only as a function of the treatment. When Groups 1-9 were compared with Control Group 10, a level of significance did occur at the .05 level. There is implication from these findings that individuals are able to separate their attitudes toward the source from their attitudes toward the topic. Acceptance of the second part of each of the hypotheses is warranted.

Discussion

The findings of the present study indicate that a question period had a significant effect on a speaker's ethos. When a question period, good or bad, followed a speech with either a high ethos introduction, a low ethos introduction, or no introduction, it produced a significant positive difference, from instances where no question period was used, in subjects' attitudes toward the source. Further, there was a highly significant positive difference in the effects produced by a good question period compared to the effects produced by a bad question period. The implications from these findings are that the speaker should take care in preparing himself for the question period, as it could mean the difference in his acceptability to the audience as a speaker. The speaker would do well to consult textbooks which contain information on speaker performance in question periods and try to follow those suggestions which should lead to success.

The findings regarding the introduction indicated several significant differences. It was found that the inclusion of the three levels of introduction in the present study produced significant differences. The implication is that an introduction produces an effect on audience attitude toward the speaker even with the strong effects of the question

period. The speaker should not rely on the question period alone to establish terminal ethos for the introduction produces effects which carry through the entire speaking situation.

When paired with the bad question period, the difference produced by a comparison of either the high ethos introduction or the low ethos introduction to no introduction was highly negatively significant. However, when paired with the good question period, the difference produced by a comparison of the high ethos introduction to the low ethos introduction was significant favoring the former only on the authoritativeness factor of credibility. The implication is that the good question period produces effects which are strong enough to override the effects of either the high or low ethos introductions on the character factor of credibility. It is the authoritativeness of the speaker that audiences question when the good question period and low introductions are used.

The differences produced by a comparison of the high and the low ethos introductions when paired with the bad question period were highly positively significant on both factors of credibility. This means that when the speaker does poorly in a question period, his ethos will be improved by some form of introduction, either high or low, but that the high ethos introduction produces higher ethos for the speaker than the low ethos introduction. Another finding was that the high and the low ethos introductions by themselves were highly positively significant. Again, the high ethos introduction helps the speaker's ethos more than the low ethos introduction. It can be generally implied from these findings that the introduction is still a source of non-artistic ethos and, where there is opportunity, the speaker should take advantage of this tool further to enhance his ethos.

Some of the findings of the present study indicate no significant effects. When the high ethos introduction and the low ethos introduction were compared to no introduction, there was no significant difference. Further, when paired with the good question period, a comparison of the high and low ethos introduction to no introduction produced an insignificant result. When paired with the good question period, a comparison of the high ethos introduction to the low ethos introduction was insignificant on the character factor of credibility.

The findings regarding the topic proved largely insignificant. When random comparisons of the treatment groups were made, the findings were insignificant. The implication here is that whenever subjects were exposed to any treatment at all, their attitude toward the topic was enhanced.

The findings stated herein allow for the following conclusions with regard to the Hypotheses of this study:

1. The hypothesis that there is no difference in audience attitude toward the speaker when a question period is used is rejected.
2. The hypothesis that there is no difference in audience attitude toward the topic when a question period is used is accepted.
3. The hypothesis that there is no difference in audience attitude toward the speaker when an introduction is used is rejected.
4. The hypothesis that there is no difference in audience attitude toward the topic when an introduction is used is accepted.
5. The hypothesis that there is no difference in audience attitude toward the speaker attributable to interaction between

the introduction and the question period is partially rejected.

6. The hypothesis that there is no difference in audience attitude toward the topic attributable to interaction between the introduction and the question period is accepted.

There are other implications concerning the introduction which can be drawn from an empirical study of the data obtained from the present experiment. The limits imposed on the present study by the degrees of freedom prevented a computer analysis of other comparisons. The data, however, can be presented without statements concerning levels of significance.

Looking at the least squares means of the three levels of introduction and the three levels of question period, the good question period produced a more favorable audience attitude toward the speaker when preceded by a high ethos introduction than when considered alone. In addition, when preceded by a low ethos introduction, a less favorable audience attitude resulted than when the good question period was considered alone. Further, the bad question period when preceded by a high ethos introduction produced a more favorable audience attitude than when considered alone. Also, when preceded by a low ethos introduction, the bad question period effects dropped still further down. There are implications that the high ethos introduction will always move the audience attitude toward the speaker in a positive direction, regardless of the speaker's performance in the question period. Similarly, the implications are that a low ethos introduction will always move audience attitude toward the speaker in a negative direction regardless of the speaker's performance in the question period.

It is interesting to point out that when considering the bad

question period, audience attitude toward the speaker was more negative when no introduction was used than when some type of introduction was used. The implication from this is that the speaker's ethos will be more positive with any type of introduction, high or low, when followed by a bad question period.

The findings regarding audience attitude toward the topic were significant in only one comparison: overall treatment effect. When the nine treatment groups were compared to the control group, a level of significance was yielded. This means that audiences that are exposed to any treatment of a topic will be affected in some way by that treatment. In this study, audiences which heard a speech showed significantly better attitude toward the topic than the audience which did not hear a speech. There is the further implication that audiences separate their judgments of the speaker and their judgments of the position he advocates. There were no significant differences in the audiences' attitude toward the topic which were attributable to the introduction variable, the question period variable, or a combination of the two.

Suggestions for Further Research

The question period as a research variable still poses several interesting questions. In the present study, the speech was a constant. Through variation of question periods and introductions, data were collected to determine the effect of these independent variables; however, all treatment groups viewed the same speech on video tape. In follow-up research, different levels of the speech might be used to test the question period. A possible variation in the speeches could be high and low ethos producing speeches.

While there is no indication from previous research that the

medium of video tape should have effected the present study in any way, a follow-up study in this regard might be revealing. Because the nature of the question period is one of spontaneity, variations might be made in the treatments so that some treatment groups view the speaking situation live while other treatment groups view the speaking situation on video tape. The live situation would have to be controlled so that prepared questions are asked to a speaker who has prepared his answers.

The present study took care to use a low ego-involving topic. This was done to avoid the inhibiting influences on attitude change which arise from high ego-involving topics. Future research might use high ego-involving topics to test the question period effects. It might prove interesting to use topics which are ego-involving to different degrees and compare the resulting effects on the question period.

There is a strong implication from the present study that a theory of recency might be relevant. By its very nature, the question period is a recency factor. Similarly, the introduction is a primacy factor. Using a design similar to the present study the two theories could be tested, since the introduction and the question period seem to interact.

Finally, this study used an Assumed Similarity between Opposites measure to determine credibility proneness. There is reason to believe that, while this determination measures levels of credibility proneness among individuals, these levels may be randomly distributed in populations. More research with this variable might prove fruitful.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Books

- Aristotle. The Rhetoric of Aristotle. Translated by Lane Cooper. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, Inc., 1932.
- _____. "Topics" in Great Books of the Western World. Chicago: Encyclopaedia Britannica, 1965.
- Braden, Waldo W. Public Speaking, The Essentials. New York: Harper and Row, Publishers, 1966.
- Campbell, Donald T., and Stanley, Julian C. Experimental and Quasi-Experimental Designs for Research. Chicago: Rand McNally and Co., 1963.
- Cartwright, Dorwin and Zander, Alvin (eds.) Group Dynamics. Second ed. Evanston, Ill.: 1960.
- Cicero. De inventione, De optimo generali oratorum, and Topica. Translated by H. M. Hubbell. Loeb Classical Library, ed. London and Cambridge: William Heinemann, Ltd. and Harvard University Press, 1960.
- Croiset, Alfred and Croiset, Maurice. An Abridged History of Greek Literature. Translated by G. F. Hefferbower. New York: The Macmillin Co., 1904.
- Edwards, Allen L. Experimental Design in Psychological Research. Rev. ed., New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1960.
- Hald, A. Statistics, Tables and Formulas. New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1967.
- Hovland, Carl I., Janis, J. L., and Kelley, H. H. Communication and Persuasion. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1953.
- Monroe, Alan H. Principles and Types of Speech. 5th ed. Chicago: Scott, Foresman, 1962.
- Osgood, Charles E., Suci, George J. and Tannenbaum, Percy H. The Measurement of Meaning. Urbana, Ill.: University of Illinois Press, 1957.
- Quintilian. Institutio Oratoria. Translated by H. E. Butler. 4 vols. Loeb Classical Library, ed. Cambridge and London: William Heinemann, Ltd. and Harvard University Press, 1943.

- Schopenhauer, Arthur. The Art of Controversy. Translated by T. Bailey Saunders. London: George Allen and Unwin, Ltd., 1896.
- Thompson, Wayne N. Quantitative Research in Public Address and Communication. New York: Random House, 1967.
- Thonssen, Lester and Baird, A. Craig. Speech Criticism. New York: The Ronald Press Company, 1948.
- Williams, Frederick. Reasoning with Statistics. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, Inc., 1968.

Articles and Periodicals

- Allport, Gordon W. and Cantril, Hadley. "Judging Personality from Voice," Journal of Social Psychology, V (1934), 37-35.
- Andersen, Kenneth E. and Clevenger, Theodore C., Jr., "A Summary of Experimental Research in Ethos," Speech Monographs, XXX (1963), 59-78.
- Berlo, David K. and Gulley, Halbert E. "Some Determinants of the Effect of Oral Communication in Producing Attitude Change and Learning," Speech Monographs, XXIV (March, 1957), 10-12.
- Bettinghaus, Erwin P. "The Operation of Congruity in an Oral Communication Situation," Speech Monographs, XXVIII, (Aug. 1961), 131-142.
- Carpenter, C. R. and Greenhill, L. P. Instructional Television Research Project Number One: An Investigation of CCTV Teaching University Courses. (Univ. Park: Penn. State, July 31, 1955), 48-49.
- Cromwell, Harvey. "The Relative Effect on Audience Attitude of the First versus the Second Argumentative Speech of a Series," Speech Monographs, XVII (1950), 105-122.
- Ewing, T. N. "A Study of Certain Factors Involved in Changes of Opinion," Journal of Social Psychology, 16 (1942), 63-88.
- Gray, Giles W. "The Precepts of Kagemni and Ptah-Hotep," Quarterly Journal of Speech, XXXI (1946), 446-454.
- Greenberg, Bradley S. and Miller, Gerald R. "The Effects of Low Credible Sources on Message Acceptance," Speech Monographs, XXXIII (June, 1966), 127-136.
- Haakenson, Robert. "The Question and Answer Period Can Make or Break Your Talk," Chemical Engineering, LXXV (April, 1968), 196-200.
- _____. "Oral Communication: Answering Audience Questions," Chemical Engineering, LXXV (May, 1968), 204-208.

- Haiman, Franklyn. "An Experimental Study of the Effects of Ethos in Public Speaking," Speech Monographs, XVI (1942), 190-202.
- Harms, L. S. "Listener Judgments of Status Cues in Speech," Quarterly Journal of Speech, XLVII (1952), 164-168.
- Hovland, C. I. and Mandell, Wallace. "An Experimental Comparison of Conclusion Drawing by the Communicator and by the Audience," Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, XLVII (1952), 581-588.
- Hovland, C. I. and Weiss, W. "The Influence of Source Credibility on Communication Effectiveness," Public Opinion Quarterly, XV (1951), 635-650.
- Kelman, H. C. and Hovland, C. I. "Reinstatement of the Communicator in Delayed Measurement of Opinion Change," Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, XLVIII (1953), 327-335.
- Klapper, Hope Lunin. Closed Circuit Television as a Medium of Instruction at New York University 1956-57. (New York: New York U., 1958), 31-35.
- Knower, Franklyn. "Experimental Studies of Changes in Attitude. II. A Study of the Effect of Printed Argument on Changes in Attitude," Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, XXX (1936), 522-532.
- Kulp, D. H. "Prestige As Measured By Single Experience Changes And Their Permanency," Journal of Educational Research, 27 (1934), 663-672.
- Lumsdaine, A. A. and Janis, I. L. "Resistance to 'Counterpropaganda' Produced by One-Sided and Two-Sided 'Propaganda Presentations,'" Public Opinion Quarterly, XVII (Fall, 1953), 311-318.
- Lund, F. H. "The Psychology of Belief! IV. The Law of Primacy in Persuasion," Journal of Abnormal Psychology, XX (1925), 183-191.
- Macomber, F. G. "Experimental Study in Instructional Procedures," Oxford, Ohio: Miami University Press, 1956.
- McCroskey, James C. "Scales for the Measurement of Ethos," Speech Monographs, XXXIII (March, 1966), 65-72.
- McDaniel, Ernest and Filiatreau, William K. "A Comparison of Television and Conventional Instruction as Determinants of Attitude Change," The Journal of Educational Research, LVIII (March, 1965).
- Rosnow, Ralph L. "Whatever Happened to the 'Law of Primacy,'?" Journal of Communication, XVI (March, 1966), 10-31.

Seigel, Elliot, Miller, Gerald, and Wotring, Edward C. "Source Credibility and Credibility Proneness," Speech Monographs, XXXVI (June, 1969), 118.

Sereno, Kenneth. "Ego Involvement: A Neglected Variable in Communication Research," Quarterly Journal of Speech, LV (Feb. 1969), 69-77.

Unpublished Material

Firnberg, James W. "An Evaluation of Closed Circuit Television as Used in Teaching Selected Courses at Louisiana State University," Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Louisiana State University, 1969.

Hildreth, Richard. "An Experimental Study of Audiences' Ability to Distinguish Between Sincere and Insincere Speakers," Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Southern California, 1953.

Reid, J. Christopher. "An Experimental Study of a Comparison of Content Learned, Attitude Toward Subject Matter, and Attitude Toward Instructional T.V. of Students in a Public Speaking Course Presented by T.V. and Face-to-Face Methods: paper prepared for Speech 300, Problems, University of Missouri, Columbia, 1960.

APPENDIX A

SEMANTIC DIFFERENTIAL TEST FORM FOR ASO

Instructions

You are asked to complete a form the nature of which may be unfamiliar to you. You will see pairs of terms which could be considered questions about a particular thing. For example, if asked to evaluate Richard Nixon, you would respond

tall X : : : : : short

or

tall : : : : : X short

if you think your answer to the question is very closely related to the term at either end of the scale.

if you think your answer to the question is quite closely related to either end of the scale, answer:

tall : X : : : : : short

or

tall : : : : : X : short

if you think that your answer is only slightly related to either end of the scale, answer:

tall ____:____: X :____:____:____:____ short

or

tall ____:____:____:____: X :____:____ short

Finally, if you think that your answer is irrelevant to the scale or is neutral to the scale, answer:

tall ____:____:____: X :____:____:____ short

IMPORTANT: (1) Place your X's in the middle of the spaces.
 (2) Check every scale; omit none.
 (3) Never mark more than one X on a single scale.

Your answers to one question should not depend on your answers to any other questions. Make each item a separate and independent judgment.

Rate each person on the scale below his name:

Neil Armstrong

qualified _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ unqualified
 experienced _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ inexperienced
 unjust _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ just
 safe _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ unsafe
 untrained _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ trained
 honest _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ dishonest

George Wallace

qualified _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ unqualified
 experienced _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ inexperienced
 unjust _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ just
 safe _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ unsafe
 untrained _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ trained
 honest _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ dishonest

Chet Huntley

qualified _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ unqualified
 experienced _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ inexperienced
 unjust _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ just
 safe _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ unsafe
 untrained _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ trained
 honest _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ dishonest

Johnny Carson

qualified _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ unqualified
experienced _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ inexperienced
unjust _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ just
safe _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ unsafe
untrained _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ trained
honest _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ dishonest

Lyndon Johnson

[illegible]

INSTRUCTIONS FOR EGO - INVOLVEMENT MEASURE

THIS FORM IS DIFFERENT FROM PREVIOUS FORMS YOU HAVE COMPLETED.

You are asked to place one and only ONE X on the scale indicating the position which corresponds most closely to your own.

For example: Given the topic "Marijuana Should Be Legalized," you would place your X as follows

right X : : : : : : wrong

if your position is very closely related to the term "right," etc. (refer back to the directions for the other forms).

Mark with an A all those positions with which you also agree, but less strongly so than the position marked with an X. The scale may look like this:

right X : A : A : : : : wrong

Next, place a U on all of those positions with which you do not agree. Leave blank all those about which you are undecided.

The completed scale may look like this:

right X : A : A : : : U : U wrong

RATE THE FOLLOWING TOPICS ON THE SCALES WHICH FOLLOW: (Remember, "rate" means your position on these subjects)

1. The Voting Age Should Be Lowered To Eighteen

good _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ bad
 worthless _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ valuable
 wise _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ foolish

2. Foreign Aid Should Be Reduced

good _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ bad
 worthless _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ valuable
 wise _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ foolish

3. There Should Be Additional Federal Aid To Cities and Counties

good _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ bad
 worthless _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ valuable
 wise _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ foolish

SEMANTIC DIFFERENTIAL TEST FORM FOR SOURCE CREDIBILITY

Instructions

You are asked to complete a form the nature of which may be unfamiliar to you. You will see pairs of terms which could be considered questions about a particular thing. For example, if asked to evaluate Richard Nixon, you would respond

tall X : : : : : : short

or

tall : : : : : : X short

if you think your answer to the question is very closely related to the term at either end of the scale.

if you think your answer to the question is quite closely related to either end of the scale, answer:

tall : X : : : : : short

or

tall : : : : : X : short

if you think that your answer is only slightly related to either end of the scale, answer:

tall : : X : : : : short

or

tall ____:____:____:____: X :____:____ short

Finally, if you think that your answer is irrelevant to the scale or is neutral to the scale, answer:

tall ____:____:____: X :____:____:____ short

IMPORTANT: (1) Place your X's in the middle of the spaces.
 (2) Check every scale; omit none.
 (3) Never mark more than one X on a single scale.

Your answers to one question should not depend on your answers to any other questions. Make each item a separate and independent judgment.

ATTITUDE MEASURE TOWARD TOPIC

YOU HAVE ALREADY RATED THE SPEAKER. NOW RATE THE TOPIC ON THE FORM BELOW:

good _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ bad
worthless _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ valuable
wise _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ foolish

APPENDIX B

HIGH ETHOS INTRODUCTION

Good afternoon. You are all members of a speech class, or speech faculty, so today you are going to hear a speech. It is my extreme pleasure to introduce to you Mr. Howard Dorgan. Mr. Dorgan is a doctoral candidate at Louisiana State University. While at L.S.U., Mr. Dorgan has distinguished himself by maintaining straight A's in all graduate course work. He is the author of a number of publications and has taught college for several years. It is my pleasure to present to you Mr. Howard Dorgan.

LOW ETHOS INTRODUCTION

Good afternoon. You are all members of a speech class, or speech faculty, so today you are going to hear a speech. The speaker is Howard Dorgan, a student at L.S.U. Howard tells me that he has had some thoughts on a particular topic and we've given him time here today to tell you what they are - Howard . . .

SPEECH ON FEDERAL AID TO CITIES

It's a great place to visit - but I wouldn't want to live there. Why the pollution, crime, parking problems, school problems, traffic and taxes are enough to turn anyone off!!! To say nothing of the slums, ghettos and unemployment! Which city am I talking about? All of them!

Today most cities are faced with mounting civic problems that they cannot handle alone and the states do not have the resources to help. The only other alternative is increased federal aid to the cities with no strings attached.

To begin with, crime is a major cause of decay in the cities. Dr. Milton Eisenhower, Chairman of the National Committee on the Causes and Prevention of Violence said in a November 24, 1969 speech that, "Violent crime is primarily a phenomenon of large cities." He went on to point out that the twenty-six U.S. cities with a population of half a million or more comprise only 17 per cent of the total population but over 45 per cent of the major crimes.

In a recent survey taken in major cities across the country, half of the women and 1/5 of the men surveyed said that they were afraid to walk alone in their city at night. Better than 1/3 of those surveyed own guns for protection. Are these people justified in their fears? Let's look at some statistics: between 1960-1968, criminal homicide increased by 38 per cent; rape increased by 65 per cent; assault incidents went up by 67 per cent; and robbery soared to an increase of 117 per cent. In 1969, the crime rate increased nationally by 11 per cent.

Since October 1, 1969, there have been over 200 armed robberies in Baton Rouge and I am sure that you're aware of the incident which took place on our campus only just last week. What is the answer? Our cities are fast becoming hell-holes. Dr. Eisenhower says the answer is more police. John J. Harrington, President of the Fraternal Order of Police says: ". . . only one method would be effective . . . firm law enforcement policy . . . more police."

How do we get more police? The average base pay for police last year was \$5,340. Most highschool dropouts have earning power exceeding this figure. To get more police, the pay must be improved and additional funds for larger police forces must be allocated. This takes money that the cities don't have.

Another surmounting problem facing the cities is unemployment which leads to large welfare rolls and poverty-stricken areas. A study just published shows that unemployment rates are far higher in large cities, and further, that certain areas within the cities are still higher. The employment figures for Detroit are 12.2 per cent; for Los Angeles 10.3 per cent; for Chicago and Atlanta 8.6 per cent; and for New York City 6.8 per cent.

In September, 1969, 4 per cent of the labor force or 3,232,000 were jobless. Economists predict 5 per cent unemployment by spring adding another 900,000 to the jobless masses.

There are various reasons for unemployment - no jobs, no transportation to the jobs, only positions for skilled workers available. How do we solve these problems? Federal appropriations seem to be the only answer. In recent years these conditions have become worsened; they will not get better without help.

The U.S. News and World Report says that "the state and federal governments have preempted the best sources of Taxation." Most mayors express the view that the property tax, which is the greatest source of a city's income, is about as high as it can go.

The only answer is Washington. The National Mayors' Convention told a senate sub-committee that what they need is money from the federal government. Mayor Lindsey of New York estimated a need of 50 billion dollars over the next ten years just to make New York City livable; Mayor Cavanagh of Detroit estimated 15 billion for his city over the same period.

The federal government does have plans in operation to help the cities, but these are not enough - and their budgets are getting cut almost as rapidly as the plans are being created. Says Mayor Cavanagh, "I feel that most of the urban aids that are enacted by Congress are inadequate. I don't know of one totally adequate program." Congressman William V. Roth of Delaware stated: "No one anywhere in government - in the White House or in the departments or agencies or in Congress - knows exactly how many programs there are, or what assistance is currently available to our schools, our cities, the poor, or anyone else."

This kind of situation spells disaster for the cities. We must appropriate more money to save our cities and we must adequately administer what programs are already in effect so as to achieve an absolute peak of efficiency in such an important matter. The cities can't provide the needed funds; the states are already choking on unbalanced budgets. The federal government must provide money to halt the pending disaster of our cities.

SURVEY FORM FOR QUESTION PERIOD

A SUCCESSFUL question period is one where the speaker:

AGREE

DISAGREE

- | | | |
|-------|-------|---|
| _____ | _____ | 1. Is aware of why questions are asked. |
| _____ | _____ | 2. Presents additional information. |
| _____ | _____ | 3. Repeats the question. |
| _____ | _____ | 4. Draws conclusions and shows how conclusions answer the question. |
| _____ | _____ | 5. If valid objections are made - he modifies his stand in his answer. |
| _____ | _____ | 6. Answers an attack with another question. |
| _____ | _____ | 7. Uses humor. |
| _____ | _____ | 8. Connects what he says here with what he has already said. |
| _____ | _____ | 9. Admits his ignorance when he doesn't know an answer. |
| _____ | _____ | 10. States where certain information can be found. |
| _____ | _____ | 11. Treats questioners with courtesy and fairness even when questions are poor. |
| _____ | _____ | 12. Compliments questioners for good questions. |
| _____ | _____ | 13. Helps listeners to phrase questions. |

AN UNSUCCESSFUL question period is one where the speaker:

- | | | |
|-------|-------|---|
| _____ | _____ | 1. Dismisses or ridicules poor questions. |
| _____ | _____ | 2. Lectures listeners on what they should and should not know and about what they should ask questions. |
| _____ | _____ | 3. Is evasive. |

SURVEY FORM FOR QUESTION PERIOD (Continued)

AGREEDISAGREE

- | | | |
|-------|-------|--|
| _____ | _____ | 4. Refuses to answer questions. |
| _____ | _____ | 5. Anticipates what the question is before the
questioner has a chance to finish. |

REASONS FOR DISAGREEMENT: (indicate which number)

ADDITIONAL QUALITIES: (use back if necessary)

My dissertation is an experimental study primarily concerned with the question period which may follow a speech. As a part of this study, I am interested in determining what the speaker can do to be considered successful in the question period, and what the speaker might do which would result in failure in this regard.

I need your help in determining the characteristics of both a good and a bad question period; that is, which qualities of the speaker will lead him to success in the question period and which qualities of the speaker will lead him to a decisive failure.

Enclosed, please find a listing of the various qualities a speaker might display in a question period. This listing is the result of a survey of textbooks on public speaking.

Would you please indicate in the appropriate space whether you agree or disagree with these qualities as they are categorized and add further qualities that you might think of at the end of the page. If you indicate disagreement with any of the items listed, would you also indicate the nature of your disagreement.

At a later date, you will be invited to view a video tape of two question periods. The tape will demonstrate qualities as determined from your participation in this study. At that time, agreement will be sought as to whether the taped question periods are clearly good or bad so that they might be used in other parts of this study.

Your co-operation in this matter is very important and will be greatly appreciated. Please use the enclosed envelope to return your completed form to my box.

Cordially,

Alan L. Mikels

Enclosure

GOOD QUESTION PERIOD

Question

You're pushing for more federal aid to cities when it seems to me that the federal government is already doing a great deal to help. How much do you want them to do without taking over the cities completely?

Answer

Your question, then, is basically, "Isn't the federal government doing enough already?" is that a fair restatement? O.K. Let me reiterate some of the points that I covered already and relate them for you. First of all, the 11 per cent rise in the crime rate was a 1969 figure. Second, the 4 per cent unemployed (3 million plus people) was a late 1969 figure. Third, the National Mayors' Convention which advised a need for 50 billion dollars for New York City alone was the last mayors' convention. The point is, these deplorable conditions exist even after present Federal aid. Now let me tell you what else that mayors convention told the Sub Committee on Urban Affairs: In New York City alone, 2 million people live in poverty; one out of every 4 schools is over 50 years old; $\frac{1}{2}$ of all housing is sub-standard; of the city's total budget, 14 per cent or 650 million dollars is spent on welfare. No, I'd have to say that present Federal aid is not enough.

Question

You mentioned federal aid with "no strings attached." What do you mean?

Answer

Thank you. This is an important point. If the federal government insists on giving aid only if it has the say-so about how and where

it will be spent, the situation might be no better than before. The cities themselves should be allowed to determine their own priorities. In fact Melvin Laird has stated, "Watts area in Los Angeles faces different problems than Harlem in New York." The point is obvious - the cities themselves know what they need. Roger A. Freeman, Senior Staff member of the Hoover Institution on War, Revolution and Peace, stated: "Some of the major problems have resulted in failures which would not have occurred, at least not on such a scale, if the state and local governments had been free to act autonomously." So we must urge for Federal aid with no strings attached.

Question

There has been a lot of talk about too much federal intervention already. Is more of this government intervention really good?

Answer

You're probably asking this question in light of all of the criticism leveled at the federal government for trying to control the states - and I think there is valid support for more aid in spite of the criticism. Let me quote Arthur Nataflin, Mayor of Minneapolis: "Critics often insist that federal intervention is destroying local initiative. They should spend some time visiting the endless meetings of the advisory committees of citizens who have worked for many months on these studies. They would see that rather than an imposition of federal rule, there has been a liberating of local energies. . . . It should be emphasized at this point that programs are locally conceived, developed, approved and managed. And the critics of federal aid should know that the alternative is not more local control but rather less; without the grant programs, there would probably be, if anything, direct federal action." Of course, not all federal money is being managed locally and

that's why I'm advocating in this case, federal money if no strings attached.

Question

How much money is being allocated by the federal government to help the cities already?

Answer

I should know, but I don't - - - I didn't bring those figures with me.

Question

(Same questioner) I have a feeling that it's a little more than chicken feed, don't you?

Answer

Yes, the chickens could feed for a long time on the money already being given to the cities. But the point is, PEOPLE can't. I believe you can find those figures in recent issues of American City.

Question

Let's go back to the "no strings attached" issue. Why can't the federal government set up local agencies to control the funds -- By this I mean federal people set up in the cities. It seems to me this would prevent any mis-use of funds on the local level - and, give the federal people the control they want while getting the money to the cities.

Answer

Perhaps I should have brought up the fears of graft and corruption of local officials myself. I know that many of you probably have visions of local officials becoming personally wealthy by virtue of federal money. Let me say that corruption exists, but no more so on

local levels than right in the Federal Government. The cities have to control their own funds. A vivid example is that of a Florida city that ended up with a boardwalk instead of a badly needed swimming pool in a poverty area because some brain from Washington decided that this was what was needed. Back to your question - why spend funds on establishing local offices when that same money can be put to good use helping solve the city problems - -

Question

You said that the only way to lower the crime rate was by having more police - and you used quotes from Milton Eisenhower and someone else to support this. I strongly disagree. We don't want a police state! I think that if people are more careful about where they go and who they let into their homes . . . and if there were more burglar alarms and cameras and the like . . . and better lighting in downtown areas and around buildings . . . and stiffer penalties for criminals . . . the rate would drop. Statistics show that a large number of criminals have a long record of arrests for the same kinds of things. Let's lock them up for good, not turn this country into a police state!!

Answer

I think your point is well taken. You could be right about other methods being just as effective as more police - - at any rate, money would still be needed to make the necessary lighting changes and so forth. I wasn't advocating a police state by any means. And I'm with you 100 per cent - - if there is another way to lower the crime rate, then I'm for it!

BAD QUESTION PERIOD

Question

You're pushing for more federal aid to cities when it seems to me that the federal government is already doing a great deal to help. How much do you want them to do without taking over the cities completely?

Answer

Apparently you just weren't paying attention. You seem to have missed the whole point of my speech. If anyone has anything pertinent to ask, I'll be happy to give it a try.

Question

Well, I have something to say. My name is Bob Neely and I have done a lot of research on this subject. It happens that we have been considering the question of federal aid to cities for some time and I'm amazed over the lack of information that you seem to have on this issue. Do you know how many programs are in operation by the federal government to help the cities? For your information, there are over 250. Do you know how much money is spent each year on urban areas? Fourteen and a half billion dollars a year! Let me give you some more of the programs already in effect and how much is being spent: relief, 3.6 billion; poverty war, 1.6 billion; regional development, 4.4 billion; some more of the programs are: aid to education; crime prevention; rent subsidies; teacher corps; pollution; housing; urban renewal; mass transit; and there are still more. You asked for a pertinent question - here it is! How can you talk about increasing federal aid to cities when you don't even have any figures on what is being done right now?

Answer

Thanks let me have the next question.

Question

You mentioned federal aid with "no strings attached." What I want to know is . . .

Answer

(interrupt questioner and anticipate question) . . . why should the federal government give aid to the cities without maintaining control of the pocketbook? - The answer is obvious; the federal government doesn't know what the cities need as well as the cities do. The question you should ask is "How can the federal aid best be doled out to the cities," and the answer is "free and clear, so that the cities can act autonomously.

Question

(same questioner) If you didn't interrupt me, that was the question I started to ask - - well, thank you very much.

Question

There has been a lot of talk about too much federal intervention already. Is more Federal intervention really good?

Answer

I don't think it's really bad - what do you think? Wouldn't you rather have federal dollars floating around than all of the big city problems hitting you in the face? That's the trouble with all you people who holler "Federal intervention!" You don't know a good thing when you see it!

Question

Will taxes go up as federal aid to cities increases?

Answer

Will taxes go up? Well, that's hard to say. Taxes are always going up - who's to say whether increased aid to cities is one of the reasons. Some budgets get cut - - others get increased. I think Nixon's been doing a fine job so far - with taxes.

Question

How much federal aid to cities is lost through graft and corruption of city officials?

Answer

I don't have any figures on that . . . and . . . I don't want to get into it!

Question

Back to the question on taxes . . . your answer was about as evasive as any I've heard in a long time. Of course taxes will go up as federal spending increases. Why don't you tell the truth?

Answer

Well, there is a good chance that taxes will go up, I guess.

Question

You said that the only way to lower the crime rate was by having more police; - and you used quotes from Milton Eisenhower and someone else to support this point. I strongly disagree. We don't want a police state. I think that if people are more careful about where they go and about who they let into their homes - - and if there were more burglar alarms and cameras and the like . . . and better lighting in downtown areas and around buildings . . . and stiffer penalties for criminals, the rate would drop. Statistics show that a large number of criminals have a long record of arrests for the same kinds of things. Let's lock them up for good, not turn this country into a police state!

Answer

It's interesting that you think you know more than Milton Eisenhower and others who have studied this problem for years. It always tickles me that whenever anyone says "increase the police force," you get some reactionary who yells "police state." All you want to do is overcrowd the prisons with small-time thieves. We spend millions on the prisons already; let's prevent crime, not wait until it happens before we do anything.

Question

Mr. Dorgan, let me ask you a question which I think is basic to this whole issue. If the federal government were to do no more than they are already doing - - of course taking into account all of Nixon's expansion programs, do you still think that increased federal aid would be necessary?

Answer

I don't know!

VITA

Alan Lewis Mikels was born on March 19, 1943, in Gloversville, New York. He received his elementary education at Oakland School in Gloversville. In June, 1960, he graduated from Utica Free Academy in Utica, New York. He entered Southern Illinois University in January, 1963, and was awarded the Bachelor of Science degree in June, 1966. He entered the Graduate School of the State University of New York at Albany, New York in January, 1966, and received the degree of Master of Science in June, 1967. In September, 1967, he entered the Graduate School of the Louisiana State University, where he began work on the Doctor of Philosophy degree. Throughout his Masters and Doctoral programs, he held Teaching Assistantships in the Departments of Speech. He is a member of Delta Sigma Rho-Tau Kappa Alpha and Alpha Phi Omega.

EXAMINATION AND THESIS REPORT

Candidate: Alan L. Mikels

Major Field: Speech

Title of Thesis: An Experimental Study of the Question Period as a Determinant of Source Credibility and Audience Attitude Toward the Speech

Approved:

J. Donald Ragsdale
Major Professor and Chairman

Max Goodrich
Dean of the Graduate School

EXAMINING COMMITTEE:

Clarence Peterson

Merle E. Braden

Alvin L. Becklund

John D. Templeton

Date of Examination:

May 14, 1970